

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIX. No. 2 }
WHOLE No. 470 }

APRIL 20, 1918

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

The War.—The brunt of the fighting has been shifted from the Morisel-Montdidier-Lassigny-Plemont-Pierremande-Folembray-Anizy line to the northern sector stretching between La Bassée, Armentières and Messines Ridge. On *Bulletin, Apr. 8, p.m.*
Apr. 15, a.m.

April 8 the enemy opened a heavy fire on the British lines between La Bassée Canal and Armentières. South of La Bassée the British positions were flanked by Vimy Ridge, north by Messines Ridge, the objective of the German attack. Though both flanks of the British armies stubbornly resisted the forty-eight-hour bombardment and the fierce infantry attacks directed against them, their center had to withdraw to the Lawe River, a branch of the Lys, and along the southern bank of the Lys itself. Neuve Chapelle, the scene of the first English offensive in the spring of 1915, was taken and passed and the line ran back to Vieille Chapelle on the Lawe. From here the British line followed the Lawe to its junction with the Lys at Estaire, after which it followed the Lys. On their southern flank the British were strong enough to counter-attack at Givenchy. Here they captured nearly a thousand prisoners and regained some of the ground which they had previously lost. At this crisis in the battle the Germans again swung northward and struck a heavy blow at the Ypres sector. From Hollebeke to Armentières they moved forward regardless of severe losses and established a line extending along the road from Ploegsteert to Wytchaete, and thence to Hollebeke, passing through Messines. The town of Messines changed hands several times, but the ridge remained in British hands. As a result of these movements Armentières was opened to the enemy on three sides. It was soon heavily "gassed" and the British had to withdraw. In the fighting which followed the withdrawal the Germans, already astride the Lys River, advanced along the river towards Estaire and towards Steenwerck and Bailleul. The fighting during this stage of the battle was of a character unequalled in intensity perhaps during the present offensive. Official British reports of Saturday, April 13, told of a further advance made by the enemy from the Ploegsteert-Estaire-Lestrem line to a line drawn from Neuve-Eglise, thence east of Bailleul

to Merville on the eastern edge of the Nieppe Forest. At this crisis Field Marshal Haig, who from the first day of the German offensive has been obliged steadily to withdraw before its onslaught, issued an order of the day to his troops, in which, after stating that the object of the enemy was to separate the British army from the French and take the channel ports, ordered every position to be held to the last man. "There must be no retirement. With our backs to the wall, and believing in the justice of our cause, each one of us must fight to the end. The safety of our homes and the freedom of mankind depend alike upon the conduct of each one of us at this critical moment." The British commander also assured his troops that the French army was moving rapidly and in great force to their support. The reports of April 13 told of the recovery by the British of Neuve Eglise, in the northern sector, three miles southwest of Messines, and that on the southern line the French had regained some ground at Orvilliers, southeast of Montdidier, and that Hangard-on-Santerre was again completely in French hands. The latest dispatches from the Lys front tell of the fiercest fighting, with the British still holding their lines. The enemy, however, claims to have taken Merris and Vieux Berquin southwest of Bailleul.

In the Toul sector and on the Verdun front the American troops were under heavy fire and made several successful raids and took some prisoners. On the right bank of the Meuse north of St. Mihiel they repulsed a heavy attack.

All doubts with regard to General Foch's rank in the Allied Army have been removed by an official note from Paris stating that the British and French Governments have agreed to give him the title of Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces operating in France.

An official statement giving the text of a telegram from Emperor Charles to Emperor William relative to the assertion of Premier Clemenceau that the former *The Austrian Emperor* recognized the claims of France to *and Alsace-* Alsace-Lorraine was issued on April *Lorraine* 11. The Emperor accuses M. Clemenceau "of piling up lies to escape the web of lies in which

he is involved" by making "the false assertion" that the Emperor had in some manner recognized France's claims to Alsace-Lorraine as just. "At the moment," says the Emperor, "when Austro-Hungarian cannon are firing alongside the German artillery on the western front, no proof is necessary that I am fighting for your provinces."

Almost simultaneously with the appearance of the imperial telegram the French government published what it affirms is the text of an autograph letter of the Emperor Charles communicated on March 31, 1917, by Prince Sixtus de Bourbon, the Emperor's brother-in-law, to President Poincaré and communicated immediately with the Prince's consent to the French Premier. In the letter the Emperor begs the Prince "To convey privately and unofficially to President Poincaré that I will support by every means and by exerting all my personal influence with my allies France's just claims regarding Alsace-Lorraine." In the same letter the Emperor gives his views with regard to the Belgian and Serbian questions. With regard to Belgium he says "Belgium should be entirely re-established in her sovereignty, retaining her African possessions without prejudice to the compensations she should receive for the losses she has undergone." The Viennese press doubts the authenticity of the letter. Some papers call it a downright forgery, others say that it was garbled.

Canada.—During the week much light has been thrown on the Quebec riots. On April 9 the special correspondent of the New York *Evening Post* presented Borden's and Laurier's version of the incidents which led to the disorder as follows: According

The Quebec Riots

to the former the Federal police arrested a man named Mercier who had been exempted from military service and detained him until his exemption papers were presented. A small crowd gathered and followed a dozen of the Federal police who took refuge in a police station, where they were attacked. The next night another crowd attempted to burn the building where the offices of the registrar are, and failing this, they attacked the offices of two pro-conscriptionist papers. The Government deemed that the municipal authorities of Quebec had not taken adequate steps to curb the disorder and therefore sent Federal troops from Ontario. These arrived Sunday morning and paraded the streets. On Monday night six civilians were slain and a great but unknown number were wounded by machine-gun fire. Laurier, rising immediately after Borden's speech, declared that the latter could scarcely mean to imply that the Mercier incident had sufficed to arouse Quebec. For months imported Federal police had been arresting Merciers and detaining them. Indeed men of class B, a class not yet called up, had been subjected to similar treatment. This caused friction, especially since among the Federal police, there

were men like Desjardins charged with dynamiting Lord Athelstane's residence. The Canadian Minister of Justice had confessed in the House of Commons that Desjardins was his employee, and that the Government had provided the bail of this *agent provocateur*. The Government had been equally unfortunate in its choice of other officers. Moreover 27,000 draft cases had been appealed; of these appeals 25,000 were made on behalf of the Government, although the grounds for exemption had been restricted practically to one, physical unfitness. These and other incidents made the law unpopular, and tactless applications of the statute led to the slight disorders of March 28. In these disturbances no lives were lost and the damage done to property was estimated by the Government press at between \$15,000 and \$25,000. On March 30 the Government decided to call on the Federal troops, alleging that the mayor of Quebec had not adopted adequate measures of defense. Then the mayor of Quebec wrote this message to Borden:

I am unaware of press accounts on which you base statement contained in your telegram of March 29 to the effect that the attitude of the municipal police authorities was passive, that no real effort was made by the civic authorities to prevent the assault on Federal officers or put down disturbers. Such accounts, doubtless, were grossly exaggerated in the outside press. The disturbances of last night and tonight are sincerely deplored by myself and citizens of Quebec. The lack of discretion, tact, and discrimination on the part of the officers responsible for the enforcement of the Military Service act seems, to a large extent, to account for these unfortunate occurrences. I sincerely hope that immediate instructions will be issued to the proper authorities here in order that further trouble be avoided.

Borden replied:

Your telegram has been received and transmitted to the Military Service Council for their consideration. They desire to have particulars of the alleged lack of discretion, tact, and discrimination to which you allude. My telegram to you made no statement beyond a reference to the press reports, which were fairly summarized therein. If these reports are inaccurate it would be greatly in the public interest that the truth should be known immediately. To that end I hope that you will let me know what steps were taken by the civic authorities to identify those who engaged in the assault upon the Federal officers and whether any arrests have been made.

Troops followed hot on this wire, but, as it appears from the appended affidavit, bloodshed could still have been avoided. Unfortunately the *Orange Sentinel* and other Ontario papers had been exhorting the soldiers to violence, and violence eventuated. Cardinal Bégin and the clergy immediately appealed to the people and were successful in placating the enraged citizens of Quebec. The following affidavit gave a clear and succinct account of events:

I, Armand Lavergne, of the city of Quebec, advocate, being duly sworn upon the Holy Evangelists, doth say and declare:

(1.) Sunday, the 31st of March, about 6:45 P. M., at my house, where I was confined by a slight attack of grippe, I was called to the 'phone by Mr. Alleyn Tachereau, public representative of the Minister of Justice for district E, under the Military Service Act;

(2.) Mr. Tachereau, who has been for long a personal friend of mine, requested me to go over immediately to the Château Frontenac, and meet him at room 301, stating he had something very important and urgent to talk to me about;

(3.) When I got there, about a quarter past seven, I was introduced to Col. Machin, and another gentleman by the name of Carruthers, captain or colonel;

(4.) After a few friendly words, Col. Machin asked me what I thought of the present situation in Quebec city, how it was caused, and the best means to face it;

(5.) I told Col. Machin that in my humble opinion the situation had been brought about by the choice and lack of tact of the Government Federal detectives charged with enforcing the Military Service Act. On this point we all agreed.

(6.) I then said that my impression was that the whole thing could be stopped if anybody was willing to go and meet the rioters, speak to them, tell them that those detectives which are known in the city as very low characters would not have anything more to do with the enforcing of the act, and that the troops who were patrolling the streets would be retired to barracks; if that were done all the trouble would end.

(7.) Col. Machin, or one of the parties present, informed me that we should try to avoid bloodshed, as the troops that night were going to fire.

(8.) To this I agreed willingly, as Col. Machin, myself, and others present were desirous to bring the thing to an end, as soon as possible, with the least serious consequences. I suggested sending anybody, and said that as far as I was concerned, I was willing to do it if I could state the above-mentioned conditions, namely, the removal of objectionable detectives and retirement of troops.

(9.) Col. Machin told me that he had not the necessary authority to assure me of that, but he would do his best to have those things accepted in Ottawa, and he thanked me for my willingness as the best means to end the trouble.

(10.) He then asked me to dine with him, which I refused, saying that I was going to try immediately, to which he consented, and wished me Godspeed.

(11.) I left the Château Frontenac and went down to headquarters, where I saw Gen. Landry, officer commanding Military Division No. 5. I told Gen. Landry that I had seen Col. Machin, and what I proposed to do. He told me it was the best service I could do them, and the city, under the circumstances. I then asked him where he expected the most serious trouble to break out that night. Gen. Landry told me the rioters had just burnt the store of Martineau on St. Joseph Street, and he was informed they were coming to lower town to the Mechanics' Supply, via St. Paul Street, and asked me to go down that way and meet them.

(12.) I then left and went down alone by Mountain Hill, St. Peter, and St. Paul Streets. Opposite the Mechanics' Supply I met two municipal policemen, and asked them for any sign of rioters, which they told me they had not yet. I then walked out St. Paul Street and met a small group opposite the C. P. R. Station, composed of about thirty, which group came to my notice as they were walking on the sidewalk, by some whistles being blown, and some of them yelling "Let us go down (*en bas*)."

I made a sign to them with my hand to stop and asked them where they were going. Their welcome to my question was very equivocal, so I said to them, "You know who I am," gave them my name, and told them that if they went further they would be mowed down by the troops; that on the other hand, I was the bearer of a message of peace if they would stop trouble. After some discussion, their number had then increased around me to about three or four hundred, who could hear what I was saying. I made them the above proposals, and a few of them suggested my addressing them to the whole

crowd, which might number one thousand or fifteen hundred. I got up on a Ford automobile, which was there, and repeated what I had said, and asked them to disperse, stating that the military authorities would rely on their honor to keep quiet, and that they in their turn could rely on the honor of the military authorities to have things in the city restored to their normal state the next day if they would be peaceful that night, and if the military authorities kept their word, to pledge themselves (the rioters) to create no further disturbances on any of the following days. To this they agreed in great majority enthusiastically, although I had to meet objections and insults from a very few scattered individuals.

(13.) After that some one suggested that a great crowd was assembled on the Jacques Cartier Market Place, and to prevent any trouble from them that I should go and repeat my remarks there, to which I agreed.

(14.) The crowd was swung back, and we walked back to the Jacques Cartier Market Place, where I repeated practically the above remarks before an audience of five or six thousand persons. The people then again pledged themselves to keep the peace, and the propositions I was bearer of were greeted with enthusiasm, except from the same few scattered voices.

(15.) After that, they requested me to let them accompany me to the Château but I begged them to disperse and go home immediately. I boarded a street car, came up to the Château, and reported to Col. Machin, who thanked me for what I had done, and I told them that, although I understood that the troops had to be kept in readiness, if they were taken away from public view, I felt assured perfect quiet would reign in the city. He agreed with me, and said he would report same to Gen. Lessard. I then reported by telephone to Gen. Landry, stating the same opinion, and also personally to Gen. Lessard, who appeared at the Château a few minutes later. I must say that, of all the people I saw last night in the crowd of rioters, I knew nobody personally except one man, to whom I had not spoken for the last five years. When I went home about one o'clock, practically all the troops had gone back to headquarters, and no trouble had been reported since.

(16.) I also want to state further that if it had not been for Col. Machin's earnest request and sincere desire for peace, I would not have taken any action in the matter, and I have signed.

(Sd.) ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Sworn before me in Quebec this first day of April, 1913.

(Sd.) H. E. LAVIGNEUR,
Maire de Quebec.

Added to this, is the verdict of the Coroner's jury which attributed the riots to the "tactless and grossly unwise fashion in which the Federal police acted toward absentees under the Military Service act." The conscription law has been modified by an order in council so that now martial law prevails in Quebec and the penalty for assembly is summary arrest by the military and conscription irrespective of the class allotted by the Military Service act.

Ireland.—On April 9, Lloyd George announced in the House of Commons that conscription would be extended to Ireland as soon as possible. He justified the act on the ground that Ireland, through her representatives, had approved of the war and voted to commit the Empire to it. Moreover, by its very character the war was as much

Conscription and the Convention

Ireland's as England's. As a consequence there should be equality of service as far as possible. The Premier then declared that conscription was not a guarantee of Home Rule; on the contrary, the latter problem would be solved on its own merits. These statements brought forth a storm of angry protests from the Nationalists, who declared that Lloyd George's words constituted a declaration of war on Ireland and that not a man would be had under compulsion. Mr. Devlin then moved an adjournment, which was defeated by 323 to 80, and the same evening, April 9, the War Power act, which will place at the disposal of the Government every able-bodied man from the age of eighteen to fifty, and in some cases to fifty-five, was introduced by a vote of 299 to 80. On April 13 the proposal of the Nationalists to omit the Irish Conscription clause from the bill was rejected in the House of Commons by a majority of 172, and the same day the clause was passed by a vote of 281 to 116. All this has lashed the Irish nation to fury. On April 9 the Dublin Corporation, by a vote of 39 to 30, warned the Government against any attempt to draft the Irish, and the Lord Mayor was requested to invite Messrs. Dillon, Devlin, De Valera, Griffith and representatives of the Irish Trades Union Congress to meet him in conference with a view to united resistance, and though Carson accepted conscription in the hope of preventing Home Rule, an Ulster delegation sent word to Dublin that Ulster would also resent the draft.

The Irish Bishops met in Dublin, amongst them many who favored recruiting, and issued a unanimous protest. T. P. O'Connor, at present in America, wired Lloyd George a "solemn warning that conscription would paralyze [Ireland's] friends and encourage [Ireland's] bitterest enemies in this country [America] and . . . render futile the best efforts of Irish leaders everywhere." Even such papers as the English *Daily Chronicle* protested against the measure as a blunder, and ex-Premier Asquith pleaded for moderation and time for serious consideration of the clause.

On April 12, while the clause against the draft was at its height, the Convention submitted its findings. There are a majority report carried by 44 to 29 and two minority reports, one by the Ulsterites, who submitted one scheme to the Convention, namely, the exclusion of Ulster, and one by a small group of Nationalists, who differed from the majority in only one important detail, namely, the control of customs, which the Nationalist minority would give to Ireland immediately. The majority report is summed up as follows:

Section 1. The Irish Parliament to consist of the King, Senate and House of Commons. Notwithstanding the establishment of an Irish Parliament, the supreme power and authority of the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters and things in Ireland and every part thereof. (Section carried by 51 to 18.)

Section 2. The Irish Parliament to have general powers to make laws for the peace, order, and the good government of Ireland. (Section carried 51 to 19.)

Section 3. The Irish Parliament to have no power to make laws on the following: Crown and succession, the making of peace and war, army and navy, treaties and foreign relations, dignities and titles of honor, necessary control of harbors for naval and military purposes, coinage, weights and measures, copyrights and patents. The Imperial and Irish Governments shall jointly arrange, subject to imperial exigencies, for the unified control of the Irish police and postal services during the war, provided that as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities the administration of these two services shall become subject to the Irish Parliament. (Section carried 49 to 16.)

Section 4. Restriction of the power of the Irish Parliament; prohibition of laws interfering with religious equality; a special provision protecting the position of Freemasons; a safeguard for Trinity College and Queens University; money bills to be founded only on a viceregal message; privileges and qualifications of the members of the Irish Parliament to be limited as in the act of 1914; rights of existing Irish officers to be safeguarded. (Section carried 46 to 15.)

Section 5. Constitutional amendments as in the act of 1914. (Section carried 46 to 15.)

Section 6. The executive power in Ireland to continue to be vested in the King, exercisable through the Lord Lieutenant on the advice of an Irish Executive Committee, as in the act of 1914. (Carried 45 to 15.)

Section 7. Dissolution of the Irish Parliament, as in the act of 1914. (Carried, 45 to 15.)

Section 8. Royal assent to bills, as in the act of 1914. (Carried, 45 to 15.)

Section 9. Constitution of the Senate as follows: One Lord Chancellor, four Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, two Bishops of the Church of Ireland, one representative of the General Assembly, three Lord Mayors, of Dublin, Belfast, and Cork; fifteen peers resident in Ireland, elected by peers resident in Ireland; eleven persons nominated by the Lord Lieutenant; fifteen representatives of commerce and industry, four representatives of labor, one for each province; eight representatives of County Councils, two for each province. Total, 64. (Carried, 48 to 19.)

Section 10. Constitution of the House of Commons. The ordinary elected members shall number 160. The University of Dublin, the University of Belfast, and the National University shall each have two members, elected by graduates. Special representation shall be given to urban and industrial areas by grouping the smaller towns and applying to them a lower electoral quota than the rest of the country. The principle of proportional representation shall be observed wherever a constituency returns two or three members.

Forty per cent. of the membership in the House of Commons shall be guaranteed to the Unionists, and, in pursuance of this, twenty members shall be nominated by the Lord Lieutenant, with a view to due representation of interests not otherwise adequately represented in the provinces of Leinster, Munster and Connaught, and twenty additional members shall be elected by Ulster to represent commercial, industrial and agricultural interests; the nominated members to disappear in whole or in part after fifteen years. Extra Ulster representation is not to cease except on the decision of a three-fourths majority of both houses sitting together. The House of Commons shall continue for five years unless previously dissolved. (Carried, 45 to 20.)

Section 11. Money bills to originate only in the House of Commons, and not amendable by the Senate. (Carried, 45 to 22.)

Section 12. Disagreement between the houses to be solved by a joint sitting. (Carried, 45 to 22.)

Section 13. Representation in the British Parliament to con-

tinue. Irish representatives to have the right to deliberate and vote on all matters. Forty-two Irish representatives shall be elected to the British House of Commons. Irish representation in the British House of Lords to continue as at present until that chamber is remodeled, when that matter shall be reconsidered. (Carried, 44 to 22.)

Section 14. Finance-Irish exchequer and consolidated fund to be established; an Irish Controller and Auditor General to be appointed as in the act of 1914. If necessary, it should be declared that all taxes at present leviable in Ireland should continue to be levied and collected until the Irish Parliament otherwise decides. Necessary adjustments of revenue between Ireland and Great Britain during the transition should be made. (Carried, 51 to 18.)

Section 15. Control of customs and excise by the Irish Parliament to be postponed for further consideration until after the war, provided that the question shall be considered and decided by the United Kingdom. Parliament within seven years after the conclusion of peace. Until the question of the ultimate control of Irish customs and excise shall be decided, the United Kingdom's Board of Customs and Excise shall include persons nominated by the Irish Treasury. A joint Exchequer Board, consisting of two members nominated by the Imperial Treasury and two nominated by the Irish Treasury, with a Chairman appointed by the King, shall be set up to determine the true income of Ireland. Until the question of the ultimate control of the Irish customs and excise shall be decided, the revenue due to Ireland, as determined by the joint Exchequer Board, shall be paid into the Irish exchequer. All branches of taxation other than customs and excise shall be under the control of the Irish Parliament. (Carried, 38 to 30.)

Section 16. The principle of imperial contributions is approved. (Carried unanimously.)

Section 17. Accepts the report of the sub-Committee on Land Purchases. (Carried unanimously.)

Section 18. Deals with the judicial power similarly to the act of 1914. (Carried, 43 to 17.)

Section 19. The Lord Lieutenant shall not be a political officer. He shall hold office six years. Neither he nor the Lords nor Justices shall be subjected to any religious disqualification. His salary shall be sufficient to throw the post open to men of moderate means. (Carried, 43 to 17.)

Section 20. A Civil Service Commission consisting of representatives of the Irish universities shall formulate a scheme of competitive examinations for admission to the public service, and nobody shall be admitted to such service unless he holds a Civil Service Commission certificate. A scheme of appointments and salaries shall be prepared by a special commission, and no appointments shall be made until the scheme of this commission has been approved. (Carried, 42 to 18.)

Section 21. The Irish Government, if desired, may defer taking over the departments of Old Age Pensions, National Insurance, Labor Exchanges, Postal Savings Banks, and friendly societies. (Carried, 43 to 18.)

The concluding paragraph submitting the report to the Imperial Government was carried by 44 to 29. The Nationalist minority report, signed by such men as Archbishop Harty, Bishop O'Donnell of Raphoe and Joseph Devlin, advocates a Dominion system which would put all Irish affairs, including taxation, under the Irish Parliament, while leaving foreign relations, the army, the navy, the declaration of war and treaties of peace under the Imperial Parliament. This report presents a detailed argument for Irish control of taxation, suggests a British-Irish commission for commercial and postal matters, pro-

poses an arrangement for imperial contribution by joint negotiations and insists that Ireland shall have the same power as the Dominions for providing local defense. Conscription without the sanction of the nation is denounced as impolitic, unjust and bound to end in disaster. The report further opposes membership in the British Parliament; it prefers a joint council, but waves objection and agrees to a delegation of forty-two members at Westminster. Agreement is expressed to a Unionist representation of forty per cent. in the Lower (Irish) House and the majority scheme for representation of the Southern Unionists. Postponement of vital problems till after the war is opposed. Ulster issued a protest signed by nineteen members of the Convention, including the Marquis of Londonderry, the Duke of Abercorn and the Lord Mayor of Belfast. The document is aimed principally at a distorted view of the Nationalists' minority report and protests:

(1) A sovereign independent Parliament for Ireland, co-equal in power and authority with the Imperial Parliament.

(2) Complete fiscal autonomy for Ireland, including the power of imposing tariffs and control of the excise, involving, as it would, the risk of hostile tariffs against Great Britain, the right of making commercial treaties with foreign countries, and full powers of direct taxation.

(3) The right to raise and maintain a military territorial force in Ireland.

(4) Repudiation of any liability for national debt, on the plea of overtaxation in Ireland in the past, but admitting the principle of a small annual contribution to the imperial expenditure.

(5) Denial of the right of the Imperial Parliament to impose military service in Ireland, unless with the consent of the Irish Parliament.

The report proceeds to reject as undemocratic the proposal that Ulster be represented in the House in excess of its population, and expresses fear that Sinn Fein would control Ireland under the Convention scheme.

Rome.—The newly established Republic of Finland has opened direct diplomatic relations with the Holy See. On March 2 the three members of the delegation sent by the Finnish Government to convey to the Vatican the official announcement of the existence of the new Government

Finland and the Vatican

were received by the Holy Father with all the honors due to official representatives of free and independent States. The delegates expressed the desire of their Government to enter into direct and friendly relations with the Holy See. The Pope acceded to their request with the utmost cordiality, and as a mark of his good-will, with his own hands conferred the decoration of the Grand Cross of St. Gregory on Messrs. Wolf and Kihlman, the heads of the delegation, and on the Secretary of the delegation the decoration of the Commendatore of the same order. The act of Finland is the more remarkable, as it is not a Catholic State, and this is one of the reasons why the *Corriere d'Italia* regards the Finnish Mission as one of the most significant in the whole history of the Church.

In its issue of March 16, the *Civiltà Cattolica* quotes a passage from the official note sent by the Military Administration of Austria-Hungary to the Holy See, which gives proof positive that it was at the solicitation of the Pope that the Italian prisoners, suffering from tuberculosis, were sent back to Italy during the months of January and February of the present year. In the quoted document the Austro-Hungarian Government begs the Holy Father to use his influence to have the prisoners of war, belonging to Austria-Hungary, but at that time held in Italy, restored to their own country. In the same issue attention is called to the fact that at the time that the Swiss Federal Council proposed an exchange of severely wounded prisoners, the Holy See addressed a formal proposal of the same nature to the belligerent powers. As a result of these efforts between March, 1915, and November, 1916, 8,668 French and 2,343 German prisoners passed through Switzerland on their way to their respective countries.

Another proposal made by the Holy See to the Swiss Federal Council concerned the internment in Switzerland of less severely wounded prisoners and those who were suffering from permanent or temporary illness. The Swiss Government gladly accepted the proposal in May, 1915, and began negotiations with a view to carrying it out. Germany, in an official reply, dated August 25, 1915, declared that the Emperor "was in agreement with the good intentions of His Holiness, and accepted the principle of internment, leaving the conditions to be determined at a later date." Mgr. Marchetti, the then official representative of the Holy See at Berne, succeeded in arranging the final settlement, and on January 26, 1916, the first transfer of French and German tubercular prisoners to Switzerland took place, 100 from each side being interned.

As noted in AMERICA at the time, on the feast of St. Patrick, whether by a happy coincidence or by deliberate design, there took place in the hall of the

The Decrees "De tuto"

Consistory in the Vatican, a ceremony which will long be remembered with grateful happiness not merely by the French and Irish, but by the whole Catholic world. In the presence of the Holy Father and many distinguished prelates, Mgr. Verde, Secretary of the Congregation of Rites, read the text of the decrees, technically called "*De tuto*," in which it was declared that the Commissions appointed by the Holy Father declared that in their opinion it was safe to proceed to the canonization of Blessed Margaret Mary Alcock and to declare the fact of the martyrdom of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh. After the reading of the decrees, Mgr. Virili, postulator of the cause of Blessed Margaret Mary, and Mgr. Riordan, rector of the Irish College and postulator for the cause of the Venerable Oliver Plunkett, expressed their thanks to the Holy Father for his gracious favor in acceding to their requests. Pope Benedict XV followed them and

spoke words of praise and encouragement, which have just now reached America. Among other things, he said:

We are grateful to the Lord for having given us the opportunity of manifesting today a new proof of our good-will toward the French nation, on which Margaret Mary Alcock casts resplendent glory and over which she will extend her loving protection. We thank Him for having given us this occasion for testifying our heartfelt gratitude to the Irish people who have always been the strenuous defenders of the Catholic Church. We extend our thanks to God in no less a degree for enabling us to make public profession of our high esteem for the religious institute in which lives without change, the spirit of St. Francis de Sales, and for the college of our own city of Rome, which was merited to inscribe on the fairest page of its history the formation of Oliver Plunkett, not merely to the sanctity of the priesthood and the episcopacy, but also to the heroism of martyrdom.

Speaking of the coming canonization of Blessed Margaret Mary, the Pontiff developed the reasons which should urge fervent souls to cooperate with renewed energy in the spread of the devotion to the Sacred Heart. He referred to the response made throughout the world to his recommendations made recently that families should be consecrated to the Heart of Christ:

We experience great joy at being able to express publicly the satisfaction we have felt on learning that since that time there has been a remarkable development of the practice of consecrating families to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Among the bitternesses which from the very beginning have marked our Pontificate and through which it seems it must take its course, the Lord has made us at all times feel His paternal hand.

Pope Benedict insisted that the approaching canonization should give added impulse to practical devotion to the Sacred Heart, and drew from the martyrdom of the Irish prelate cogent reasons for the practice of strong Christian life.

At the end of His discourse the Holy Father rose and pronounced a benediction which deserves to be enshrined forever in Catholic memory:

May the blessing of God descend in fulness on France, the cradle of Blessed Margaret Mary, and bring it to pass that from the land, in which appeared the first tiny spark of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, there may also come forth an unfailing example of constancy and fervor in this devotion, such as will rejoice not only the cloisters of the Visitation, but the entire Christian world.

May the blessing of God be the recompense of the heroic people of Ireland, at all times strong in defense of Catholic truth, and give them today, the day consecrated to the glory of its great apostle, Saint Patrick, a foretaste of the joy, to be theirs at no distant date, of being able to claim the intercession of another son of Ireland.

May the blessing of God be extended, in fine, to all the children of the Catholic Church, and keep them from ever forgetting the harmony that exists between the two decrees, published today by the Holy See; for if one affirms the theory, the other teaches the practice. If Blessed Margaret Mary demands of all of us fervor in devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Venerable Plunkett stimulates us by his example not to let ourselves be conquered by the difficulties we may encounter in striving for that end.

The date of the official act of the Holy Father by which these two heroic souls will be ceremoniously raised to the altar has not been announced.

The Supremacy of Conscience

J. HARDING FISHER, S.J.

A WRITER in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*, filled with the spirit of true patriotism and carried away by flaming indignation against conscientious objectors, recently allowed himself to be betrayed into enunciating a proposition which, in its unequivocal and unrestricted form, must be pronounced unethical. He says: "In all matters of national preservation the individual conscience must submit to the national conscience." These words sound strange in the ears of a people pledged to secure liberty for themselves and their posterity and committed to the belief that freedom, no less than life and happiness, is one of the inalienable rights of man.

By what show of consistency can we profess to be ready, as the President has so clearly and so truly professed us to be, to spend every resource at our disposal to bring liberty to strangers abroad, if in the same breath we deny to our citizens at home the most precious of all freedom? It has been the glory of our country that it has known how to conciliate individual liberty with State authority; and its success in so doing has come very largely from the recognition in actual practice of the principle that civil power, from its essential limitation, cannot licitly invade the sanctuary of conscience. This sanctuary has hitherto been respected in the United States; and it would be a disastrous step, directly militating against national welfare, if its unquestionable inviolability were to be disregarded. Even two such extremes as rationalism and the Catholic Church are agreed on the incompetence of the State to interfere in the relations of the citizen with God.

It so happens that in the matter of the war the national conscience of the American people is correct and furnishes a safe guide for the individual conscience. Undoubtedly the preponderance of public opinion, being so overwhelming, should give pause to every objector and furnish him with irresistible motives for reconsidering his own personal erroneous views and rectifying them in the light of right reason. It is not too much, therefore, to say that in the present instance the individual conscience would do well to listen to argument and conform to the national conscience; but this is far from saying that it must submit to it. The word, "must," at once raises the question, "By what compulsion?" and to this question no satisfactory answer is forthcoming.

National conscience is a very vague, elusive thing, difficult at all times to crystalize and by no means to be identified with the editorial views of an only too frequently venal press. If national conscience is taken to mean only the united opinion of the great mass of the people, it has no supremacy whatever over the individual

conscience, for all men are equal and held to be equal before the State. Moreover, the mere fact that many men are agreed on a point of morals gives them no right to override the conscientious scruples of others. In all such matters the individual has a right to lay himself open to persuasion. He has also the right not to be forced.

The views of the majority are not endowed with infallibility as the writer of the article in the *Post-Intelligencer* seems to assume, an assumption certainly not warranted by the facts of history, and the less likely to have even a semblance of truth in a country where the right of private judgment is vindicated for every irresponsible thinker, and where it is becoming the fashion to rule God and His rights out of court, thus undermining the ultimate basis of responsibility, without which conscience is meaningless. Nor has national conscience, understood as the official expression of civil authority, full power to contravene the practical dictates of conscience.

The State can licitly restrain a man from performing actions which are clearly against the common good, as, for instance, the practice of polygamy or the driving of motor cars at excessive speed in crowded cities, but it cannot lawfully compel a man to do things which he conscientiously believes are forbidden by God. The consistency of the Menonites, who have shown themselves ready to perform every difficult and menial service in Fort Taylor, Louisville, shows their sincerity and entitles them to toleration of their religious reluctance to bear arms. They are in error concerning the question of right and wrong, but they are acting on the same principle as St. Agnes did when she braved both fire and sword rather than abjure her Christian faith, namely, that when conscience declares that the ordinances of God and the State conflict, God rather than man, must be obeyed.

In the scale of supremacy the State is superior to the individual but is inferior to God. As a consequence State rights, although they take precedence of individual rights, yield to those of God. Precisely, therefore, as the individual must bow before the law of the State, so must the State bow before the law of God. Once the mandate of the State has been promulgated, the citizen is bound to respect it; similarly once the mandate of God has been promulgated the State is obliged to respect it. From this appears the supremacy of conscience. Conscience promulgates to the individual in the concrete case the mandate of God, and bears the stamp of Divine authority. Consequently civil authority must respect it. For the State has no authority, except what it has re-

ceived from God, and it is inconceivable that God should give the State authority to command what He Himself forbids.

In the abstract discussion of right and wrong, conscience is not the court of last appeal, nor indeed is unaided reason, as rationalists claim; the supreme arbiter of questions of morality is the Divinely-appointed, Divinely-enlightened Church, the guardian and interpreter of Revelation, which pronounces infallibly on questions, not merely of Faith, but of morals. Incalculable harm to the formation of correct views on right and wrong has been done to humanity by the repudiation on the part of the reformers of the supernatural guidance of the Church.

The Catholic can always appeal to the Church's higher wisdom when he has need to form his conscience; in many cases reason alone catches only broken lights of truth, but reason, enlightened by Faith, sees clearly and surely. Non-Catholics unfortunately have deprived themselves of the Church's direction; but for them, no less than for her own children, the Church vindicates the supremacy of conscience in concrete cases where the individual is face to face with the necessity of acting or abstaining from action. Her teaching, based upon the foundations of sound philosophy and Divine Revelation, maintains that if a man, having taken reasonable care to form his conscience on the morality of any action arrives at the prudent decision that he personally is bound, by what he understands to be God's will in the matter, to perform or omit the action, he has the right of following this practical dictate of his conscience without let or hindrance from outside influences, provided the performance or omission of the action in question does not violate the rights of others or involve serious injury to the community. The reason for this teaching is that the action, no matter what may be its objective morality, takes on its subjective moral complexion in the concrete case from the reasoned judgment of the individual conscience, and it goes without saying that a man may not do, nor be compelled to do, what he, here and now, thinks

—it may be erroneously—involves sin; for the malice of sin is in the will which is ready to do what the intellect judges to involve an offense against God.

The philosophical basis of this statement is not hard to grasp. Man has the strict obligation, arising from his relation of creature to the Creator, of rendering to God homage and service and glory, an obligation from which he cannot be emancipated even by the Supreme Being, much less by any inferior power. This he does by observing the moral law. This moral law is manifested to him in the concrete case by the practical dictate of his conscience. He has therefore the obligation of following the dictates of his conscience, not indeed a doubtful conscience or an erroneous conscience which he has not taken reasonable care to form correctly, but a certain, prudential, or even an inculpably erroneous, conscience. Now every obligation implies a corresponding right. It follows therefore that the obligation of obeying one's conscience carries with it the right to do so.

Freedom from compulsion in following outwardly the dictates of conscience is necessary for the moral well-being and the moral dignity of every person, and for the attainment of the end for which he was created. It flows from the very nature of man, and hence cannot be abdicated; it comes from the very essence of the intelligent being by the very fact of his creation and destiny; it is an unassailable gift of God, not a concession of the State nor the result of a convention entered into by the citizens; and hence it is independent of the State and superior to any merely human legislative power. Liberty of conscience, therefore, in its proper sense, and not of course in any of the broad meanings of the word which are practically synonymous with license, is a right of which a man may not licitly be deprived. It is just such well-meant but false, or at least ambiguous, statements as that made by the writer of the article under discussion that tend to break down the morals of the country and to pave the way for anarchy and despotism. No democracy is safe that does not respect the supremacy of conscience.

Feminism and Gargoyles

GEORGE D. BULL, S. J.

TO the average feminist the most absorbing part of a Gothic cathedral would be, we imagine, not the arches nor the angels, but the gargoyles, for feminism seems to have a predilection for distortion.

If we are to believe the movement, woman's real history is something very like this: Ages ago when the race was young man secured the advantage over woman during the physical helplessness of confinement. This position he improved with such zeal and skill that, as generations went on, woman receded further and further from her primeval plane of equality, more and more learned or was forced to learn dependence on man, until

beneath his inexorable tyranny, not only her mind and qualities of soul, but even her very physique gradually changed and the "weaker sex" was introduced to the world. No occupation which required more than a modicum of assertiveness was allowed her, no relaxation which would take her from the home was countenanced, until the tradition grew that "woman's place was the home." From a being as free, as assertive as man, as strong physically, as keen mentally, she became a creature blunted in intellect, stunted in body, with but one sphere, the home; with but one occupation, to mend and patch what man had broken and torn; with but one

human function, to bear his children and aid his race to inherit the earth. If woman protested, man was ever ready with a rod or a reason, or finally, we are told, with a creed, to keep her quiet. In some ages the rod predominated and woman was a slave; in others the reasons, the soft excuses that lured her from her birthright of equality, as in the Middle Ages, and set her apart to be worshiped and further softened, dressed in silks and jewels that her body might be the more desirable to him who owned it and held it in his sway.

Of this long history modern woman is the heir, and her status today, though veneered by many a soft layer of external difference, is still the same; she is a drudge or a doll, or both, but a human being free to develop her own personality she is not. Her subjection begins in the home, it is carried on in the school, where, by such things as feminine modesty, gentleness, and so on, she is prepared to accept her allotted place as an inferior, a "clinging vine about the sturdy oak—man." A thousand times a day is this inferiority, in various ways, kept before her eyes. The deference of men, the rising, the bowing, the very garments she is forced to wear, are badges of her subjection.

Now grotesque as this picture is—and surely to the non-feminist it can appear as nothing else—it fairly represents, I think, what is at least implicit in the writings of the most typical feminists. The distortion of woman's history, nature and present status are unquestionably evident, yet to attempt to pry what truth the picture may contain from the absurdity surely present would be about as useful as attempting to trace the lines of the normal human countenance in the weird features of a gargoyle. Who, for instance, could find in this feminist picture the hitherto accepted glory of woman's status in the Middle Ages? Woman *was* raised aloft, but only that her serene simple presence might be the star that would lead men to the noblest and best on earth; she *was set apart*, but only in the sense that as queen of life's tournament she was spared the blood and blare of the mêlée.

But it is feminism's view of the modern, rather than of the medieval woman, which best illustrates this inherent predilection for distortion. One example out of many possible must suffice. Feminism is fond of pointing to certain figures in modern society and of finding in society's attitude towards them strong justification for its own existence and for its sworn object to "emancipate woman." It points to the woman in the shop and cries "dependence," it singles out the woman in the home and shrieks "repression," and when it comes to the woman who has fallen, it rings the changes on a single word, "injustice." Woman, it will tell you, either marries, in modern society, or she does not. If she does, she surrenders perforce independence of personality even as she surrenders her name; if she does not, she is denied the open use of one of the most fundamental of human faculties, sex, and if caught in its surreptitious use, be-

comes an outcast from society, while her male partner may admit his guilt with a grin of impunity. Here, it will tell you, is the very essence of injustice. But here, we make bold to echo, is a striking example of the defect in feminist vision.

In the crime of the woman who surrenders honor, it sees nothing but the inequality of society's attitude between her and the man. It has focussed its attention on the penalty, not on the sin, and is not so much concerned as was the hero in the "Mikado," that the "punishment fit the crime," as that one criminal should have no advantage in sinning not conceded to another. This is a situation so fundamentally awry, so curiously distorted that it almost defies delineation. It is as though Bill Sikes or Fagin came before society and complained that he had neither the opportunity for plying his trade nor, when apprehended, caused the same stir as his more genteel counterpart, Raffles. Or again it is as though De Quincey's artistic murderer, Williams, should cry "injustice" at receiving no better treatment than a common bungling throat-cutter. The complaint would be no more naive, the cry "injustice" no more grotesque than the feminist attitude on the double standard. In both cases the viewpoint is the same—a vision focussed not on the proportion between the penalty and the wrong done, but upon the personality of the wrongdoers; a curious parade in the limelight of people usually glad to shun even daylight; above all, a mentality so impervious to incongruity that it can actually see injustice, even in inequality to sin. So strange is the situation, so at variance with the normal, that it would be ludicrous were it not for what it implies as to the state of the public conscience. Certainly no more unswerving index of defective moral vision can be found than this: That a movement can arise, exist, and even prosper, which, in the dreadful position of the "woman living outside the law," can find nothing to mention—not the crime against society, not the perversion of a faculty, not the degradation of the whole human nature, nothing except that she is a victim—the victim of "injustice."

These two instances, then, the history of woman as implicit in feminist writers, and the feminist attitude on the "double standard" will illustrate that quality of feminist writing which, for want of a better name, I have called "distortion." Though it has many forms, some more or less tangible, others defying expression, no one can go very far into the pages of Ellis or Key and be for long unconscious of its presence. It is an intellectual irritant, a kind of mental alkali dust, in the atmosphere of which the non-feminist reader simply writhes with the constant necessity of ever separating the true from the false and of rescuing the sane from the absurd.

It remains now to point out one inevitable conclusion from what has thus far been said. If feminism distorts what it looks upon, then much of its cry for "emancipation" is baseless; the enslaved woman whom feminism is seeking to free does not exist. She is for the

most part a phantom. Feminism has simply misread the facts.

But here, obviously, it may be objected: "If feminism is concerned with a phantom, why object to the movement at all? If we have in feminism only another Don Quixote and the mill, why give it any serious attention?"

Bernard Shaw, a feminist of extraordinary frankness, has given the answer—a gem of truth flashing from as black a setting of falsehood as was ever penned. In "the womanly woman," he says, "a whole basketful of ideals of the most sacred character will be smashed by the achievement of equality for women and men." Here is the reason why we may not ignore feminism. For the movement may, after all, theorize, but it does not live and operate in a realm of imagination. It may find the reason for its existence in a phantom, but the subject matter of its efforts is real existing womanhood. Feminism, in practice, whatever it may be in theory, is *not* tilting with a mill; it is meddling with the most sacred relations of human life,—principally with the relation of one man and one woman bound irrevocably in the sacredness of the home. The world cannot allow these ideals to go because feminism is having a nightmare any more than it could allow an astygmatic barbarian to blow down a Reims because he saw only a gargoyle. There are abuses in the modern woman's status; all men do not live, with regard to woman, the ideals Christian civilization puts before them; there is work to do, and possibly feminism might help to do it; but only if it corrects its viewpoint, only if it looks not to the gargoyles, but with broader vision, aloft to the arches and the angels.

The Cardinal of Reims

COMTESSE DE COURSON

AMONG the great Churchmen of France, who have earned the lasting regard of their countrymen, is a venerable Cardinal, who bravely keeps guard over his ruined cathedral under the fire of the enemy. His Eminence, Cardinal Luçon, Archbishop of Reims, is well over seventy, but, like his colleague and fellow-worker Dr. Lauglet, Mayor of Reims, his physical vigor seems equal to his moral endurance. These two old men are the moving spirits of the half-ruined city, many of whose inhabitants cling tenaciously to their homes and stoutly refuse to seek any other place of safety. Dr. Lauglet governs them with the quiet authority of former and happier times, and keeps up the old traditions of order and discipline, despite the German shells. As far as he can, he repairs day by day, the damage done to the houses and streets by the bombs. Owing to the dearth of able-bodied men and the menace constantly overshadowing Reims, he cannot attempt to rebuild the ruined buildings, but the streets are regularly cleared of the debris

and every attempt is made to secure that sense of order, self-respect and cleanliness that goes far to make men's spirits better and brighter.

The Mayor watches over the material interests of his much-tried city, the Cardinal over its spiritual welfare. United by their common love of Reims and their fearless devotion to duty they remain at their respective posts faithful to a task, which in these days, has a tragic meaning.

Since the beginning of the war the Cardinal has only once been absent for a few weeks from his archiepiscopal city. This was at the end of August, 1914, when his duties as a member of the Sacred College called him to Rome for the election of the new Pope. There he heard of the invasion of France by the enemy and of the entrance of the Germans into Reims. On September 3, 1914, the election of Benedict XV took place and that same day, Cardinal Luçon had an audience with the Holy Father and begged permission to return to France immediately, without waiting for the new Pontiff's coronation. He explained that delay might prevent his reentering Reims. The permission was given, and he started homewards. He arrived in Paris on September 9, during the battle of the Marne, and reached his archiepiscopal residence two days after the enemy had withdrawn from the town.

In speaking of those days he often alludes to the intense anxiety which made him lean out of his motor, to catch a glimpse of his beloved Reims. When the twin towers of the cathedral appeared, a great wave of joy swept over him. On entering the town his joy turned to sorrow. The enemy's guns had begun their work. The streets already bore the marks of the shells, and a crowd of refugees were making their way to less dangerous zones. At the sight of their distress the Cardinal got out of his motor and surrounded by his people made his way to the cathedral. Blackened by fire and stricken by the bombs, it was still standing, a vision of tragic grandeur. The Cardinal had much to learn from his children of the events that had taken place during his absence. He was told that his coadjutor, Mgr. Neveny, was a hostage in the enemy's hands, that his priests, Mgr. Landrieux, the present Bishop of Dijon, at their head, had heroically saved the lives of the German prisoners who were sheltered in the cathedral. The enemy's shells had set fire to the great basilica. The wounded Germans were removed by the little band of priests, almost in spite of the protests of the inhabitants of Reims, infuriated at the shelling of their cathedral, over which floated the Red Cross flag.

Since then, the venerable Cardinal has remained at his post. In the space of one month his house was struck eleven times by the enemy's shells. He succeeded, however, in saving the episcopal archives. When the bombardment is more violent he takes shelter in the cellar. Every day he visits the cathedral. Generally accompanied by his coadjutor the old man makes his

pilgrimage to the shrine so dear to him, counts the wounds of the noble edifice and, as far as lies in his power, has the damage repaired. The rest of his day is spent among the stricken people or the soldiers, who keep guard in and around Reims. Many of his friends or colleagues have been killed at his side. Seven of the city churches are hopelessly injured and all the churches of his diocese on the fighting front are in ruins. Nevertheless "My priests are at their post," adds the Cardinal with fatherly pride, "and are fulfilling their parochial duties as best they can, under tremendous difficulties." No wonder that the people of Reims cling to their Archbishop.

When some portion of the town has been more violently attacked by the German guns, he hastens to the spot where the people crowd around him: "Thank you for coming here," they say, "we want your encouragement." The Cardinal then visits the ruined houses, reassures the survivors and prays with them by the side of their dead. When some of the inhabitants decide to leave they find it difficult to say good-by to their Archbishop. After a terrible bombardment in April, 1917, the Mayor prevailed upon a certain number of families to leave Reims. Cardinal Luçon went to bid them farewell. "Come with us," they urged as they pressed around the venerable figure. "You know that I must remain," was the answer. "My duty is to stay at my post." "But you will be killed and we shall never see you again." "God is the Master, my children," and the Cardinal tore himself away from the departing exiles, who clung to his hands as if they could not bear to lose him. One of the strongest bonds between the Archbishop and his flock is their common love for their noble cathedral. "My people," he says, "are more distressed by the damage done to it than by their own personal loss."

The soldiers quartered in and around the city bring into the Archbishop's strenuous life a ray of joy and consolation. "During these terrible years I owe to them the greatest joys of my ministry," says the old man. In recognition of his services the military authorities made the Cardinal honorary chaplain of a certain regiment. The regiment has lately been honored by the distinction of *la fourragère*, a badge awarded only for exceptional

services, and the Cardinal is now entitled to wear it on his red robe. He also wears the Cross of the Legion of Honor, presented to him on June 17, 1917, by President Poincaré. That same day a hail of shells deluged Reims and the ceremony took place in a cellar. There were no flowers, no music, no speeches, only a few whispered words from the President speaking in the name of France to the Cardinal, who so bravely upholds the honor of the Church by his fidelity to a supreme and dangerous duty.

The Archbishop makes it a rule never to leave his shattered city except to visit the soldiers quartered in the neighborhood, or the military hospitals situated within a short distance. In November, 1917, however, he visited Paris and was present at the annual meeting of the Catholic University. In his opening speech, Cardinal Amette, had a special greeting for his venerable visitor from Reims, "Who, for the last three years, has faced the bombs and shells, close to his mutilated cathedral and close to his people. Like the good pastor, he refuses to desert his flock when it is attacked by the enemy." Mgr. Baudrillart, in his report of the work done by the Catholic professors and pupils during the last year, also did homage to the venerable Cardinal. What adds considerably to the interest of Cardinal Luçon's personality is his extreme simplicity. "I did my duty only," was his answer to President Poincaré, when the latter congratulated him on his noble conduct during the last three years. He owned that when the Legion of Honor was pinned to his red robe, his thoughts went out to the priests, nuns and civilians of Reims, his fellow-sufferers, to whom he attributed a large share of the honor conferred upon him. As for the *fourragère*, bestowed upon him by the soldiers, the distinction gave him unqualified pleasure. "The men whom I have seen at work for the last three years, thereby made me their humble pastor, their equal and I am proud to be considered by them as a Cardinal and a soldier."

May the venerable Archbishop live long enough to hear a *Te Deum* of thanksgiving echo under the shattered roof of his cathedral. Such is the wish of all those who know what his presence meant at Reims in the days of its great sorrow and agony.

Catholics and Social Legislation

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S. J.

"IT'S coming yet, for a' that," Burns sang in a fine elation of triumphant optimism, "That man to man, the world o'er, shall brothers be for a' that!" To make this possible, religion must doubtless be the prime influence in the lives of men. Without it there can never be any true brotherhood of man. But after religion itself, and prompted and di-

rected by it, the most potent means at our command is social legislation.

Brotherhood is the thought uppermost in the minds of all today. It has never been fully realized in any epoch of modern history except among the early Christian communities and in certain periods of the Ages of Faith. We cannot hope to restore it again except by the

reunion of all men in the one true Fold of Christ. So will all mankind be one in Him. But while our best efforts should be given to bringing about this happy consummation, we may not pause in our social labors while we are striving to attain that supreme end. The immediate remedy, ready at hand, is social legislation animated by the spirit of Christ and of His Church. For such legislation we shall find the entire world receptive.

No social legislation can ever be final. Economic conditions are in a constant state of fluctuation, and periods of tranquility are followed by renewed contests of conflicting interests. There have been centuries of comparative rest, when social adjustments had been satisfactorily established by law and the status of industry and commerce changed but slightly. On the other hand there have been critical periods when entire phases of economic life or the entire economic system of nations, or of the civilized world itself, imperatively called for a reconstruction. After a sudden and violent struggle and at the cost of a deluge of blood, or else peacefully and in the silent lapse of years, a new social order rose out of the old. Today the world is apparently entering into another great climacteric. A clear historic retrospect is needed if we would rightly face the possibilities of the future.

The hour of such a change had struck when at the dawn of modern history, at a time when centralized governments were unknown and industrial life had not yet begun in the renaissance civilization, the early European farmers, unable to protect themselves against piratic invasions and in constant danger from marauders, sought shelter under the shadow of some powerful stronghold and rendered personal service in return for their safety. In the same manner their own lords found it necessary to give fealty to still mightier overlords, and thus an organized resistance against all foes and disturbers of the peace was made possible. So the feudal system arose with its undoubted benefits and its obvious evils, yet withal an economic necessity of those turbulent days.

But the time came when the evils of the system began to outweigh its benefits. The villeins fled into the rapidly growing cities and the guilds arose with their high ideals of a free Christian manhood. The hour of a second transformation had struck. Yet at first the complete change became effective in the cities alone. Often the freedom of the craft guilds was won only after periods of violence and bloodshed; in other instances, as in England, a quiet and peaceful development took place. A further crisis, however, was inevitable. It came with the peasants' war that followed hard upon the awful havoc of the Black Death, comparable only to this world-war itself, no less universal and no less terrible in its destruction of human life.

In all the preceding economic crises, which far outweighed in importance the political struggles of kings and nations, social legislation had been the one means, after religion itself, of securing peace and prosperity to

all classes. The more perfectly this legislation was adapted to each changing economic period and the more perfectly it applied the unalterable Christian principles of justice and charity, the happier was the entire population.

A new and momentous crisis awaited the world at the very period of the Reformation. It was not in any way connected with the latter, but arose inevitably out of the economic circumstances of the time, the invention of machinery and the immense growth of the city population, not to mention other similar conditions that vitally affected the methods of production, and consequently called for the most sweeping changes in social legislation. The elements for a peaceful readjustment were not wanting and could be found in the existing guilds. But the Reformation rendered this readjustment impossible and delayed for almost four centuries the needed social legislation which might at once have obviated all the social misery and economic chaos that was to follow. Nothing indeed could have been more foreign to the guild principles than "The concentration of so many branches of trade in the hands of a few individuals," as Pope Leo XIII. described the economic situation which resulted, "so that a small number of very rich men have been able to lay upon the masses of the poor a yoke little better than slavery itself."

This four-century-long retardation and retrogression of social legislation, this casting-back of the masses into a new state of industrial serfdom far worse than the old from which they had been freed, this degradation of labor from the exalted dignity to which it had attained in the ages of Catholic Faith, was due to the false individualism which came as a consequence of the Reformation. Directly it was brought about by the paralysis inflicted upon the guilds.

Robbed by the "reformed" autocracies of the time, that found in Protestantism a most advantageous economic ally, the guilds were not merely deprived of those immense possessions, which, though consecrated to religion, had been in great part devoted to charity, but they were above all things debarred from the religious influences that had been the mainspring of their enlightened social legislation. Thus, in England, they became little more than convenient spoils for king, queen, or court favorites. Highly approved methods were invented of turning their revenues into sources of private emolument for these exalted patrons. Hence the impossibility of meeting the new social conditions by fitting social legislation and adapting to new economic developments the old principles of religion, brotherhood and co-operation. The powers of economic legislation were retained exclusively in the hands of the rich, who used them for their own purposes of exploitation.

The fact is that today we are taking up the thread of social legislation precisely where it was broken off at the Reformation. We are seeking to apply to the changed conditions of our time the principles of brotherhood and

co-operation which the Church applied in her guilds 400 years ago, and which have been ignored during the intervening period in our dominant economic system of industry and commerce. But how shall this be done without the aid of the Church?

The danger of radicalism, never greater than in periods like the present, can be met in no other way than by constructive legislative action. It is a folly to imagine that it can be destroyed by legal repression. Remove the crime of profiteering and the edge is taken from anarchism. The cure must begin with attacking the source of the evil. In the same way Socialism cannot be fought intelligently by directly assailing its principles and ignoring the corresponding ethical unsoundness of the capitalistic system. Both extremes are equally reprehensible and perilous. Both are equally opposed to all true rights of property and individual liberty. In adhering rigidly to our Catholic principles, in preventing by sound legislation the future concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, in promoting anew our ideals of co-operation and of the widest possible diffusion of ownership among the many, we shall not merely follow our Catholic pre-Reformation traditions, but we shall find ourselves in agreement with the ablest minds of our day. More than all this, we shall be in advance of our own age, the heralds of a new era of social justice through Christian legislation.

History has taught us her lesson. If the world is indeed entering into a period of great economic changes, as all admit, it is important that we ourselves direct these changes along peaceful lines and towards Christian ideals. It is not an optional task, but a duty which confronts the Church. Thus shall we be able to preserve the world from the bloody cataclysms of the past which have so frequently preceded the epochs of economic transitions.

No mere surface legislation will suffice today. We must boldly strike at the very root of economic evils. Why attempt merely to strike off the hydra-heads of innumerable secondary evils instead of reaching the very heart of the social injustice? We do not want a multiplicity of laws that defeat their own purpose, but measures of such far-reaching and vital importance as the legal minimum wage. Similar fundamental legislation will apply to shares and the direction of industries, to taxation of incomes and profits, to the unearned increment and other primary questions. In all these problems the clear teaching of the Church is imperatively needed at the present moment, and nothing in the whole range of social science will prove so thoroughly satisfactory as that teaching itself, even to the most genuinely progressive men and women of our time. It would be a fatality as well as a folly for Catholics to overlook their immense possibilities at this critical period of world history, when civilization is being shaped anew. Shall it be formed on the anvil of Marx or shall we provide that it may be wisely fashioned by the loving hands of Christ?

On the Road to Rome

JOSEPH F. WICKHAM

AS you come up from Naples toward the Empire City on the Tiber, a strange silence steals over you; not the silence of weariness, but the stillness of thoughtful mien in the realization that in a few brief hours you are to appear in the presence of majestic Rome. And as you roll along over the fertile plains, past harvests that will ripen again before the twelve-month counts itself a year, you have but a divided gazing for the cities and hamlets and all the towers and busy haunts of men. The smoke-wreathed cone of the ancient hill of Vesuvius is behind you, and you look back no more. All the smiles of the sunny southland are receding into memory's unladen recesses, and all the laughing voices of idyllic days are sounding their gayety in spirit-halls that are moving farther and farther from the living hour. Not forgotten for a moment are the gladness and the laughing and the song, but yielding their places to other guests. For Rome is in your heart, Rome and Cæsar. Rome and Cæsar, conquest and triumph, majesty and power, warring hosts and victorious eagles, empire of land and submission of seas, the world. This is the burden of your silent thought. And you are picturing the Colosseum and the Forum when Caserta and old Capua are flashing by you, and it is the river of the Eternal City you seem to see when the Volturno falls into view, dragging its dark-grey waters toward the Tuscan sea, past orchards and vineyards unsurpassed on the soil of Europe. The spell of thought is broken, perhaps, when you behold green mountains, sun-kissed and shadow-laden, rearing themselves loftily, and grouping their fantastic earthworks in chains of billowy hills. For on the breast of one stands the watcher of fourteen centuries, St. Benedict's monastery of Monte Cassino, the far-famed temple of devotion and learning whose light has never paled. And Aquino wakes the train of remembrance, and the Angelic Doctor is speaking once again the truths of philosophy in the tones of old that make things heard full as mighty as things seen. So you will go, through many a lovely valley, and through ancient cities nestling happily in the hills, Ferentino and Segni and Palestrina that used to call itself Praeneste, and a host more; and they are worth an undistracted watching. But all the time you are sharing your heart with Rome. And then the Via Appia in the grey distance. The city at last. *Salve, Roma!*

The Via Appia first, and it is not unjust that the Eternal City should offer her old majestic road as the primal gift of her heart. For your mind is with hosts unconquered and triumphs of fallen emperors and pageants of days of fighting men and man-made gods. And so the Via Appia gives them to you. Even through the hazy distance you seem to hear the measured tramping of uncounted thousands of shield-slung warriors and the clanking of iron sabers, and in imagination you see the sun flashing on burnished breast-plates, and the silver eagles carried aloft proclaiming a Roman victory, victory, nothing but victory. A thousand thousand Romans, men and women and youths and maidens gay, are crying their *aves* to brother and lover and husband, as the well-trained troops of the Empire swing by in procession with the sweep and dash and irresistible vigor and firmness that have won themselves the spoil of a hundred cities, and made their leader the greatest man in the world. Back they are marching from Spain or Africa or Asia, back they are coming victors, always victors. Golden treasure for Roman coffers, golden jewels for Roman matrons, golden empire for Roman glory, golden coronets for Roman Cæsar. For where Cæsar was, there was victory, and where conquest was, there was Cæsar, this was empire's meaning. Marius had marched down that road, and the vengeful Sulla, and the famous Pompey, but Cæsar was the greatest, and the greatest brought empire and world-sway and the fulness of glory. For seven-hundred years Rome had fought for it all, and now it was hers. And her champion refused the proffered crown and won death. For so are men ever unjust.

But this is only one tiny picture in all the wonderful romance of Rome, and it is but your day-dream as you faintly catch the outline of the Appian Way. But this afternoon when you are hiding from the sirocco weather in your hotel overlooking the *giardino* of Queen Margherita upon the Pincian hill, you will begin somewhere near the beginning of the story, and every day, perhaps, come a bit closer to patching together the warp and woof of Roman days and Roman ambitions and the toiling and the moiling of a sturdy people to achieve a greatness that was never thrust upon them; a greatness that measured the span of seven centuries to attain; a greatness that was born amid the sand-swept heat of African tropics, that was wrung from shivering bivouacs under the cold stars of Gaul, that was won amid sinking galleys when the tumult of half-mad sailors rose above the desolate moaning of a pitiless sea; a greatness that they battled for and wept for and prayed for, men and women, old and young, and that finally, when they had spent their souls and wearied their social sinews, when the worm of decay was creeping into their hearts and the game was well-nigh played out, they attained.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should not exceed six-hundred words.

Prohibition and the Mass

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As the Hon. Dudley Wooten, a lawyer of many years of honorable service at the bar, has pointed out in AMERICA, the contention of S. L. B. to the effect that the Constitution of the United States is "an instrument of *grants* and not of *limitations*" is a conclusion "not debated by competent lawyers and publicists." Nor does this conclusion show any undue sympathy with the late "Jeff Davis," lamented or deplored, according to sympathy or birth-place. For the Tenth Amendment says clearly:

The powers not *delegated* to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

I am therefore at a loss to understand how Father Kenny in his excellent article, "Prohibition, the Constitution and the Mass," can accuse S. L. B. of giving utterance to "recrudescences of the ante-secession period." Equally groundless, so it seems to me, is his characterization of Father Blakely's contention that "as far as the Constitution of the United States is concerned, the States are free to establish any or prohibit any religion." The contention may not be correct, but as it is upheld by so respectable an authority as Zollmann in his recent "American Church Law," as well as by older authors, it can hardly be termed "fantastic." Furthermore, it is clear that the First Amendment lays an inhibition upon Congress *only*.

In this precise respect, I think, Father Kenny hardly does justice to the arguments advanced by S. L. B., and others. With a wealth of historical learning, he proves conclusively that Congress has always favored the free exercise of religion, for without a single exception, his citations refer to acts by Congress, not by the States. But S. L. B., Mr. Wooten, Mr. Elder, and others who have written on this subject in AMERICA, never dreamed of saying that Congress was in the habit of passing acts in restraint of freedom in religious belief, or of practices consistent with public order. They read the inability of Congress to do this very thing, in the First Amendment.

New York.

J. W.

"Slopping Over"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the closing paragraph of J. E.'s "Slopping Over" communication in AMERICA for March 9, commenting on the record-

ing of Catholic activities in war-work, he advises: "Let us make the sacrifice demanded of us willingly, wholeheartedly, uncomplainingly. But let us quit 'slopping over.'" Needless to say this advice is superfluous. The numbers in which our Catholic men are going to the front prove a willingness and a wholeheartedness that needs no urging, and as to "complaining," I fail to see where it comes in. What he calls "slopping over," I call "rubbing it in." The angle from which one views the matter has much to do with the name you call it. Bigotry or ignorance has long been doing the "slop-over" act, by persistent misrepresentation of Catholic standards, especially our attitude towards patriotism, and now that the occasion has arisen to prove our position, now that our Catholic young men are eagerly and cheerfully pressing to the front in numbers far surpassing their proportion to the population, I see no reason why such a fact should not be emphasized, not only with a like persistence but, for a good reason, with double insistence. "Rub it in." Good oil and wine should not be lost in these Hooverizing days, on the gangrenous wounds caused by disappointment in the vitriolic minds of muck-rakers and mud-slingers. Shout to them rather from the housetop, reminding them of their misrepresentations. By all means "rub it in."

Fort Bayard, N. M.

PATRICK A. SUGRUE

Ireland's Fate

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have often wondered why I cannot see the objects of the war as others seem to see them; and your editorial, "England, Ireland and America," has set me wondering again.

I wonder why I cannot see as you do that "The war is ours for freedom's sake, that small nations as well as large may enjoy the right of self-determination, and thus work out their destiny according to high purposes." And also why I cannot see that we are fighting to obtain for Ireland the right to determine for herself whether she shall remain within or without England's empire; that we are fighting that Irishmen may enjoy, even within the empire, the measure of freedom necessary for national prosperity.

I doubt that our Government is willingly going to interfere between England and Ireland in any way whatever. That is my belief, and it is founded on authority and reason. My authority is our President. In his message of January 8, there is no general statement about the right of self-determination, such as was in his previous messages. In that message he says all Russian territory must be evacuated; Belgium must be evacuated; all French territory must be freed, and the wrong done to France in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine must be righted. Italy is to get Austrian territory, and the peoples that go to make the Austrian empire are to be given the freest opportunity of autonomous development. Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro must be evacuated. Nationalities, other than Turkish, now under control of the Turk, must be accorded autonomous development. Poland must be freed and made independent. "What about Ireland?" Nothing, not a word. In the message of January 8 we have specification, not, as in previous messages, general statements. It is true generality again appears in the message of February 11, in the statements:

That peoples and provinces are not to be bartered about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were mere chattels and pawns in a game, even the great game, now forever discredited, of the balance of power; but . . . every territorial settlement involved in this war must be made in the interest and for the benefit of the populations concerned, and not as part of any mere adjustment or compromise of claims amongst rival states; and . . . all well defined national aspirations shall be accorded the utmost satisfaction that can be accorded them without introducing new or perpetuating old elements of discord and antagonism that

would be likely in time to break the peace of Europe and consequently of the world.

But in the forefront of this message, February 11, he speaks only of the peoples, provinces and territory the Central Powers and their allies control, and, inferentially, these are the only peoples, provinces and territory that are not to be bartered, and whose national aspirations are to be accorded the utmost satisfaction. Evidently he means by "every territorial settlement involved in this war," what the *Evening Post* calls territory "dislocated" by the war. Ireland, therefore, by intentional omission is eliminated.

England will never consent to Ireland's independence; nor will she consent to all Ireland home rule so long as the Carsons continue their opposition. It is inconceivable that England appealed to our Government for aid without assurance that such help would not mean even official suggestion, "frankly and in the public view," that Ireland be accorded the right of self-determination. It is almost preposterous to think England would hail our deciding participation in the war, if there were no understanding there would be no interference in what Ian Hay euphemistically calls England's domestic trouble.

It may be that indirectly through our participation in the war Irishmen in Ireland will be given the right to determine the political future of their country; but, if so, it will be the result of the efforts of the Irish race in America, and I am wondering if the English tradition with respect to the Irish will permit of those efforts being efficacious. What is that tradition? Why, pick up almost any book written by an Englishman, and many Americans, for that matter, that touches on Ireland and you will find the tradition. It is that the Irishman is warm-hearted, hospitable, and witty; slothfully indolent, thriftless, a lover of inebriety and quarrels; impatient and unhappy under restraint of law and order; temperamentally and religiously unfitted for self-government; mentally superficial; intellectually brilliant, but unstable and an impracticable visionary. The last places I found this English Irishman were in the "Oppressed English," and "The Soul of Ulster." W. F. Monypenny has this Irishman in "The Two Irish Nations"; he is utterly opposed to home rule, but tries to be fair, and says:

There are, indeed, many defects in the character of Irishmen, and not confined to those who live south of the Boyne; but of all such defects history, and that too, comparatively recent history, supplies the sufficient explanation. To fix our eyes for the moment on the larger Irish nation, if the people of that nation are prone to violence and deficient in respect for law, it is because for a long period law was for them constituted injustice and violence their only resource; if they are idle, it is because they were denied the fruits of their industry; if in politics they are wanting in the practical spirit, it is because they were so long shut off from the realities of government; if they surrender themselves too readily to demagogues and agitators, it is because they were deprived of the guidance of their natural leaders; if their patriotism takes other forms than allegiance to the kingdom or empire in which they live, it is because they were long taught to feel as aliens within them. "*Tout comprendre c'est tout pardonner*," and the student of Irish history will be able to extend some tolerance even to their crimes.

Now this English picture of the Irishman has been drawn times innumerable for centuries; and, although it is untrue, the English and Scotch and many Americans believe it, and so do many Irish. No Irishman need accept this picture of his countrymen on the say so of anyone, least of all those who condemn Ireland and all things Irish, yet many do. The writer left Scotland, after living the first fourteen years of his life there, with this picture thoroughly impressed on his immature mind. The number of full grown Irishmen he has met since Easter Week, 1916, who are permeated with this tradition is—well, irritating; and their permeation is exposed by their depreciation of an independent Ireland, then shrinking with dread at the thought of

Irishmen in Ireland governing their native land. Unthinking men may believe anything; and it would seem that from the English traditional Irishman not all thinking men of the Irish race escape. For have we not Dr. Walsh telling us his race are prone to violence and deficient in respect for law, by saying that if there had been Irish-Americans present at a meeting in Buffalo they would have disregarded law and order and by unlawful mob violence assaulted a speaker!

Some men of the Irish race imbibe this tradition through association with Englishmen who condescendingly tolerate them; and those who are infected this way couple with a deprecatory opinion of the Irish an adulatory estimation of the English. I am sure one of these is a New York lawyer. Listen to him as he speaks of the leaders of the Easter rising: "Those leaders, full of enthusiasm about a something quite indefinable which they called 'the Irish republic,' made their appeal to the Irish enthusiasm for the ideal and the beautiful."

A school boy can tell what a republic is; but an "Irish" republic, ah, that soars in the realm of the indefinite far above the comprehensive powers of a man learned in the law. The ideal is usually sought by an idealist; and an idealist is most always considered an impracticabilist, if I may be permitted to coin that word. An Irish republic is indefinable, therefore impracticable. A great many Irish believe an Irish republic possible, therefore they are impracticable. Now let us see what he says of the English. He quotes an Englishman on the Irish question, but does not name him, and says: "He approaches the subject with an open and disinterested mind and with a candor and honesty that I like to think are characteristic of the liberty-loving English people." He also says:

The English do not hate the Irish. As a rule the English admire the Irish tremendously, though at times their admiration is mixed with apprehension or misgiving, not merely of the Irishman's intellect and brilliancy, but of his keen common sense and practical wisdom and the dramatic expression of Irish temperament.

I do not think the Irish hate the English; but they have an irrepressible desire to have their country and themselves let alone by the English. And it is the dramatic expression they give to this desire that causes the English apprehension. And I am certain the English do not hate the Irish; for English contempt of the Irish is too great ever to reach the dignity of hate. He admits that part of the tradition which concedes intellectual brilliancy to the Irishman; and he may be safely challenged to name an Englishman who attributes common sense, keen or otherwise, and practical wisdom to the Irish. It is hard to refrain from asking whose liberty the English love; certainly not the Irishman's.

Among others who believe in the English-Irishman are many powerful Americans whose love of England is greater than their respect for America, and who are opposed to self-determination for Ireland other than that which England may determine; and it was certainly not their intention that our participation in the war should mean interference in England's "domestic trouble." These men are brutally frank, and declare Ireland must remain within the empire, a naval base for England's safety. It is not strange that among the best known, if not the most powerful of these men, the Choates, Becks, Putnams, etc., are some of the gallant thirty-nine who signed the declaration characterizing all those who resented Mitchel's treatment of our charitable institutions as deserving of "emphatic condemnation."

This letter is longer than intended, and I shall end it by repeating that if our participation in the war is to give to Ireland the right of "self-determination," it will be through the efforts of those of the Irish race in America who believe Irish men and women are no worse than those of any other race, and a great deal better than most others.

New York. JOSEPH FORRESTER.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 20, 1918

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

What is an American?

A LIST of "casualties in France," recently published by the War Department, opens with the names of O'Connor, Redmond and Loehr, dead on the field of honor, and of Spiegel, severely wounded. Other names, taken down at random, with no thought whatever of proving a preconceived thesis, are Douglass, Hahn, Murphy, Brown and Thill, "died in hospital," and Wilson, Kunz, Bedernicek, Cavazza, Ferde and Rutledge, slightly wounded. A study of this roll of honor may give some answer to the question, "What is an American?"

Of these fifteen names, three, O'Connor, Redmond and Murphy, are unmistakably of Irish origin. Brown and Wilson may furnish some grounds for controversy, since they might be either English, Irish, Welsh or Scotch. Here they are classified, along with Rutledge, as probably English, thus bringing the Anglo-Saxon total to a precarious three. Douglass is as Scotch as heather, Cavazza is plainly Italian, and Bedernicek is a representative of the Slavic races. The calculation thus accounts for three Irish and three English names, and three names traceable to Scotland, Italy and Eastern Europe. But the palm of honor, it would seem, must go to the men whose ancestors sought these shores from Germany, for six names—Loehr, Spiegel, Hahn, Thill, Kunz and Ferde—can be assigned to none but a Teutonic root.

What, then, is an American? Is he one who was born within the boundaries of the United States? Is he a man who prates of patriotism and spends the rest of his time in planning schemes to evade the income tax? Must he be a member of the Mayflower Society, or a Son of the Revolution? It is not easy to state with precision what qualities are necessary to the making of an American, but a man who is willing to lay down his life for this country would seem to merit the name. One thing, however, is certain. He need not be an Anglo-Saxon. He may even be a naturalized German.

In these days of hysteria, which have already brought us the disgrace and humiliation of mob-violence, that is a truth which should not be forgotten.

The Index in New York

IT is with a surprise fully equivalent to a shock that the antiquated, retrograde, narrow-minded Papist reads of a "campaign" which counts many devoted followers in New York. He feels that his thunder has been stolen. Ideas which he thought copyrighted are being freely appropriated by men and women who have no connection whatever with the old religion. Plans which, for these many years, he has contentedly accepted as "medieval," are being refurbished for the purposes of this campaign which is determined to remove, peacefully if possible, by force of law, if necessary, certain books now reposing on the shelves of the New York Public Library.

All this commotion merely means that in twentieth-century Manhattan, the once-despised principle of the Index of Forbidden Books has been placed upon a pedestal of honor. For the volumes in dispute are unquestionably of a character not calculated to cheer the spirits, or further the aims of the American people. Their intention, according to the *New York Tribune*, is "to deify the German war-lords and to praise the German achievements and aim." Consequently, they are not fit reading for the indiscriminate crowds who patronize our public libraries. Books which "deify" vice may safely be put into their hands, but books which "deify the German war-lords" are intolerable. "Therefore," concludes the *New York Tribune*, editorially, "these books ought to be withdrawn from general circulation."

This advice implies a change of policy, for which the Catholic has surely not been prepared by the current of public opinion dominant during recent years. The principle that certain books and writings have no right whatever even to exist, much less to be circulated, he has always accepted. But if one thing has been dinned into his ears by magazine and newspaper advocates of "near-thought," it is this: that every cause has its right to a day in court, and that to close one's mind to the statements of any propaganda, however discredited by decent folk, is to write one's self down as intellectually unfair and dishonest. In consequence of this theory, every agency, capable of influencing public opinion has been freely used in this country, for the exploitation of such uplifting organizations as the anarchists and the I. W. W., and for the promotion of causes so valuable to the individual and to society as divorce, legalized polygamy, feminism, and birth-control. Nothing was to be considered sacred, nothing immune from attack, not even Almighty God Himself. When the Catholic timidly ventured to assert that certain topics should not be discussed in public by untrained minds, and that books denying the ultimate sanction of all law and order were fit only for the public hangman, he was told with an air of finality that the "truth" could never be discovered if "complete and free discussion" on any subject whatever were not always fully open to all. The troubled times have forced some return to common-sense. An easy-

going Government has brought home with some force its constitutional right not only to control the overt acts of the citizen, but even to limit the circumstances under which he may express his thoughts and opinions.

Books in defense of the maxim that might makes right, or of the principle that the end justifies the means, break down, as far as they can, the sanction of all law. Rightly, therefore, will they be proscribed by the New York Public Library. The New York campaign to remove books which belittle American ideals by "praising German achievements and aims" is easily justified, for the principle upon which it rests is undoubtedly valid. But the leaders of the campaign, afraid of logic, shrink from the ultimate conclusion. What do they propose to do with publications which, under the guise of "art," corrupt the morals of young and callow readers? Rightly excluding the arrogant glorification of German militarism, will they permit the circulation of those books which, by making every man a law unto himself, attack the supreme dominion of Almighty God? If we are to have an index, it ought to contain other titles besides those listed under the heading "Germany."

The One Foundation

THERE was a time when the most "orthodox" among the American Protestant denominations held fast to one dogma. They did not prefer to call it a dogma, but dogma it was, declaring the Divinity of Jesus Christ. These sects took the position that only if Jesus Christ were God could He be accepted as the Founder of Christianity. If He was not God, they thought, He was, at best, nothing more than an "interesting personality," but if He were God, He could deliver a message to mankind, and rightly insist that it be accepted by every rational creature. The "Church" was an institution which assumed the duty of perpetuating God's revelation through Jesus Christ. If it delivered that revelation, complete, unimpaired, it had fulfilled its duty. Withholding any part of Divine revelation, it failed utterly in its purpose, even though its clergymen preached in crowded temples.

The older American Protestantism acknowledged principles which had been rudely attacked in the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, and in that acknowledgment, illogical as it was in Protestantism, lay its strength. Incomplete in foundation, and utterly at variance with revelation in many necessary doctrines, "old-fashioned Protestantism," at least as it existed in this country, could always boast one prime virtue. It did not deny the Divinity of the Son of God. If it could not preach all the truth, it could, and did, teach some of the truth. Hence it is with feelings touched with anything but exultation, that the Catholic views the practical disappearance of this one dogma from present-day Protestantism. Rationalism, the legitimate outcome of private judgment, has had its natural effect. Today a Protestant may regard Jesus Christ as a fallible member of a fallible race, like to us in all

things without exception, and suffer no loss of standing. More than this, he may even be permitted to promulgate his blasphemy as head of a theological school, or, a fairly common occurrence in England, he may be advanced to the Episcopal Bench.

In answering the question, "Has Christianity failed?" a prominent Protestant clergyman recently observed that, in any case, a great deal of Protestantism masquerading as Christianity had certainly been rejected by the world as useless. Modern thinkers had tried it, only to find it illogical in theory and unworkable in practical life. No other result could have been looked for. When the only safe foundation has been rejected, the whole building must soon tumble into ruins. "But now as ever," continued the clergyman, "it is the spire of the Catholic Church, pointing to Heaven, which bears witness to an institution insisting on the Divinity of Jesus Christ. There is where we must stand if we would survive." But who shall lead Protestantism back to Christ? If, searching the Scriptures and appealing to reason, the Protestant concludes that the new religion which knows nothing of Christ and dogma, is better, he can rationally take his stand on a right furnished by Protestantism itself, the right of private judgment.

The First Service Flag

THE first service flag, as it has well been said, was raised on Calvary. There the first great sacrifice was consummated, the world's supreme service was rendered to mankind. Ever since has that Cross of Christ, the first service flag of Christianity, been sacred to the Church. It was honored in the days when the Apostles went forth to preach Jesus Christ, and Him crucified; and it is glorified today in its position over a million altars. Once drenched with the blood of the Divine Victim, it now shines radiant in the light of the Resurrection morn.

With reverent hands it is hung upon the walls of every Christian home. We find it where the woes of the world bow down the head of the Vicar of Christ, and in the humblest chamber where a loving heart is beating in union with the Crucified. Far more than a mere symbol is that first Christian service flag. It is an inspiration to Christian deeds, an incentive to heroic sacrifice, a motive of supreme devotion in the service of God, of country and of our fellow-men.

Wherever that banner hangs it recalls the story of that love of Christ, greater than which no man hath, whereby He laid down His life for us. Hence that readiness for sacrifice which is bred in every truly Catholic heart: sacrifice for the Church, sacrifice for the Christian upbringing of children, sacrifice for institutions of charity and zeal, sacrifice for home, for country and for God. History bears on every page the testimony to this spirit. Without it no one can be a true Christian. It implies the renunciation of the world's flattery and favors, for we cannot doubt the Divine assurance that

if the world hated the Master and persecuted Him, it will deal no better with His faithful servants. Nor should we wish to be more tenderly treated. Indeed the love of the world for us would be the surest sign that we ourselves have proved renegade to that service flag of Christ.

Yet in the school of war the world has been taught one lesson. If it once tore down the crucifixes from our churches in the Reformation, if it banished them from our schools under the rule of a French atheistic Government, if it vainly tempted the Christian martyr to trample upon it in token of apostasy, if it denounced as idolatrous the very reverence shown to that service flag of Christ, it has now been made to confess, in its own practice, the beauty and truth of our devotion. What human emblem can be more sacred in the eyes of all the world than that modest service flag we see hung from the window of some humble home? It tells of the brave youths who have gone forth in their prime of life to offer for their country all that earth holds dear. It speaks of the young wife's anxious fears, and tender hopes, and loving tears; of the mother's heart that bleeds and the mother's hair that daily grows more silvery underneath the silent burden of grief, even though the sorrow be borne heroically. Who indeed might hope to put into words all the voiceless eloquence of that tiny emblem, that mere span of cloth which every breeze can lift and every gust of wind can toss about, but which is sacred to us all with a world of tender thoughts and fond affections woven in with every fiber of its texture? Yet what is the greatest glory that is cast about it but a reflection from the Cross of Calvary, and what are the highest hopes that can rest upon it but the light of the Resurrection morn?

Sectarian Jugglery

THERE is a Methodist paper in Chicago called the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*. Its standard can be gaged from the fact that not long since its editor was guilty of a gross perversion of truth and professional ethics, by pretending to quote verbatim from AMERICA an article into which the editor of the Methodist paper had deftly inserted his own words. This infamy accomplished, he calmly proceeded to use the illegitimate product of his perverted soul as one basis of an attack on the benighted Papists. Later he adorned his pages with this delicious bit of news about our soldiers, from the pen of no less a person than a Methodist bishop:

The Catholics gather in the Young Men's Christian Association buildings, receive the khaki-bound copy of the New Testament, and rejoice for the first time in the possession of a portion of the Word of God. They are hearing for the first time, many of them, the preaching of the Gospel, and are deeply interested in the strange, new preaching which insists that there must be a vital relation between creed and conduct. They are fearing the inconsistency of coming away from Mass, where their knees knelt before the sacred symbol, and at once returning to their gambling and their profanity.

Such men and such papers are, of course, quite hopeless; as a consequence, it is not a matter of surprise that, at this critical period, the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* should manifest its dark heart once again by attributing to Catholics, by presumption and statement, dishonesty and evil motives in regard to statements about the number of Catholic soldiers. The paper attempts to refute claims made about the quota furnished by Catholics to the army, a perfectly legitimate act. But why argument, if such there be in the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, should be interspersed with attribution of dishonesty and accusation of evil motives can be explained best by editors who mutilate a document to score a point, as did the editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*.

The method in his present bit of apology is quite in keeping with his former achievements. In almost every instance he chooses comparatively small camps situated in distinctly Protestant regions, and recruited, in great part, from similar regions. Moreover, if words mean anything, his words will convey the impression that he exhausted all available statistics in his effort to arrive at the truth. But in point of fact such is not the case. Other figures which tell heavily in favor of Catholic majorities were easy to get; in fact such statistics were published long since. Thus Camp Gordon reported 14,159 Catholics, or 41.7 per cent, and Camp Gordon was omitted from the Methodist list. Why? Camp Hancock reported 40 per cent Catholic and Camp Hancock was omitted from the Methodist list. Why? Omitted too were Camp Greene which was about 40 per cent Catholic, Camp Upton, about 50 per cent Catholic, Camp McClellan, about 45 per cent Catholic, Camp Devens, over 60 per cent Catholic. Why were all these omitted? A chaplain at Camp Devens declared that the 301st Infantry is 91 per cent Catholic, the 304th 90 per cent Catholic, and he proceeds to say that no regiment at Devens was less than 50 per cent Catholic. This was all omitted from the Methodist list. Why? And the Methodist editor might have investigated the number of Catholic volunteers, the best of all soldiers. He would have found the figures far higher than the number of Catholics in the country warranted. Instead of doing this he rails at a distinguished prelate who has never forged a document, for not taking "greater pains to gather statistics" and for not including more camps in his calculations!

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate's* task done, that dear, frowzy little girl who smells strongly of Ceylon tea and pink lemonade, the *Christian Advocate*, takes up the same popgun and shoots hard this way:

These returns also give point to an inquiry why the complete figures are unobtainable. On the showing made above, it would seem that the Catholics would demand the publication of the census in full, for the incomplete returns leave the Catholic authorities in the position of having solicited contributions from the general public and demanded chaplaincies from the

War Department upon grounds which were not warranted by the facts.

How sweetly Methodist the accusations are! But it is "the way with them" from bishop to editor. And talk about boasting; in the face of figures what can equal this?

"I was born in the Methodist Church," said the Secretary (Daniels). "They have sent more men into the army, more

nurses to the front and more prayers to Heaven than any others."—N. Y. Tribune, April 6, 1918.

Why, years ago, those words were attributed to Lincoln in reference to the Civil War! But perhaps the reporter forgot to say that Secretary Daniels announced this fact, or the Secretary may have been indulging in the figure of prolepsis, or perhaps during the passion of eloquence he may have held both hands on high and "crooked" two figures of each hand in the form of quotation marks.

Literature

ON THE FARM WITH VERGIL

"ARM OR FARM." That double call has gone forth to the whole country, the call of the ploughshare and the sword. The latter, though too often heard in history, sometimes dies away over the peaceful fields. The former ever rises from the soil, compelling and masterful: to those who catch its music, as alluring as the voice of the great mother; in crises like the present, with a menace almost in its appeal, should it be unheeded. Back to the soil! That is the counter-echo to that other watchword of the hour: To the trenches, the gun-deck and the firing line!

History repeats itself. About 2,000 years ago, after the civil wars in which Roman had been arrayed against Roman, and the exhausted world was trying to renew its energies, a far-seeing statesman saw that nature supplied a remedy for the existing evils. In his mind, Mother Earth herself was to become the nurse and the healer of a weakened race. The veterans of Brutus and Cassius, the men who had fought with Agrippa at Actium, with Caesar, under the snows of the north, or with Antony, under the shafts of a Syrian sun, were to be lured back to the farms of the reedy Mincius, to the vine-slopes and corn-lands of the Sabine hills, and to the orchards, cool and moist, along the Tiber's "golden wave." The statesman was Caius Cilnius Maecenas, whose name seems to be identical with that of patron of letters and friend of art. He saw that the sword had to be beaten into the ploughshare, that, if Italy were to be saved, agriculture had to be revived. But a program had to be framed and a plea written to allure the veterans of so many fights from the camp to the sheepfold and the farm. Though the agrarian question was ever a burning one at Rome, there was no Department of Agriculture under Augustus, to distribute seeds to the public or to enlighten it with pamphlets, published at the expense of the Treasury, on the best methods for the cultivation of alfalfa and vetch. But Maecenas was, perhaps, better inspired. He asked the Vergil of the "Eclogues" to write a poem on agriculture. The answer was given in a manner worthy of the subject, the patron and the poet. The bard who had sung of Tityrus and Menalcas, now wrote his masterpiece, the "Georgics."

This great work forms a splendid apology of labor. It is a hymn to the great mother, a song of the soil. In these four short books, Vergil joins to the imagination and the fancy of the poet, the practical knowledge of the genuine farmer, the enthusiasm of the patriot and the far-seeing gaze of the economist and the statesman. It was a theme for which his genius was eminently fitted. In the "Eclogues," he had shown how keenly he was alive to the charms of nature. But, beautiful as they are, they are rather indefinite in their tints and vague in their outlines. They are rather artificial copies of a great original, Theocritus. Damoetas and Mopsus remind the reader of the prim and besatined shepherds and shepherdesses of Watteau. The bloom and the pose do not seem to be natural.

Not so with the "Georgics." Though Vergil was not afraid to follow in the footsteps of others, the poem is thoroughly original. If there are echoes here and there of "The Works and Days" of Hesiod, of the "Phaenomena" and "Diossemeia" of Aratus, of the "Georgics" of Nicander, the "De Re Rustica" of Varro, and if the influence of the "De Rerum Natura" of Lucretius is felt in the general atmosphere, the "Georgics" have a stamp absolutely individual. It is no longer Arcadian and Sicilian shepherds whom the poet sings. Italy, the Italian yeomen now rise fair and virile on his canvas. The Watteau graces have given way to the truth, the vigor and the fidelity to life which we see in the "Gleaners" of Millet. Here Vergil is a genuine realist. The life of the Italian farmer, his daily and annual round of duties, with his fields, his stock, his vines and his bees are brought home to us with all the truth of one who loves the beauties of nature, who has felt the repose, the calm, the worth and the dignity of a country life, and who contrasts the peace, the security and the inward nobility of such a life with the unrest, the rivalries, disappointments and treacheries of the bustling world. If the "Georgics" are a didactic poem, they are not the lifeless thing we usually associate with the name. The breath of the wide-aisled forests is upon them, the shadows of beech and oak and yew fall across their pages. They are a deep and solemn symphony vibrating with the mystic voices of stream and hill, tingling with the strains of the ceaseless anthem of earth.

In the four books of this immortal poem, the most perfect in form and rhythm that Vergil ever wrote, he sings of agriculture proper, or the tilling of the fields, of arboriculture and especially of the growing of the olive and the vine, of the rearing of the cattle and the horse, and of the labors, the battles and the polity of the bee. Nothing seemed to be more commonplace. But the commonplace has been viewed with the eye and the heart of the artist. The instinct of the born farmer and yeoman ever lingered in Vergil from the days of his boyhood, with his father on the little farm near Mantua. That instinct inspired him to tell us that ploughing should begin in early spring and that the land produces the best crops when ploughed twice in summer and twice in winter, that the husbandman must study the quality of the land, that he must pray for a wet summer and a dry winter; that the olive thrives best in a gravelly soil, but that the vine gives its finest clusters in a rich and rather moist ground rising to the south, that if he wants a fine crop of corn, the farmer must sow it in black crumbling soil or ground reclaimed from the forest. Vergil knows the points of a good horse: "He has a high-arched neck, a clean-cut head, a short barrel, a broad back, and his noble chest is a mass of muscle." He knows how sheep and goats should be housed, he analyzes the diseases which attack the stock. It is evident, even when his conclusions do not coincide with those of Huber or with the minute investigations of Henri Fabre, that he has made a close and loving

study of the life, the polity and the habits of the bee. But far above all this technical knowledge, for the most part accurate, he has the poet's eye, the poet's insight into the secret of nature and her hidden beauties. In the bee, he sees the individual short-lived, but the race enduring, and notes the marvels of the hive's little commonwealth.

Who but a poet and one so tender as Vergil, could give us the pathetic picture of the ox smitten with the plague, of the ploughboy unyoking the bullock, that in its dumb way mourns for the death of its team-mate, and leaving the plough standing idle in the unfinished furrow, a scene that Landseer would have loved to paint? Was ever the call of stream and wood more bewitching than when Vergil hails the gleaming waters of Spercheus, as

Those deep Laconian shades
Made vocal by the songs of Spartan maids,
The glens of Haemus and the waving bough
To fan my aching limbs, my fevered brow.

With what skill he relieves the details of the farmer's toil with those splendid episodes, the praises of labor and the country, the account of the prodigies which followed Caesar's death, that marvelous story of Eurydice and Orpheus, which last, may, it is true, break the unity of the poem, but which in spite of that defect, is one of the gems of Latin literature. The panegyric of Italy, in the second book, would alone suffice to raise the work to the dignity of a national monument.

*"Salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
Magna virum."*

With what love he celebrates that "Saturnian" land, the fertile mother of nature's richest fruits, the nobler mother of a hardy stock of heroes and great men. No other land is like Mother Italy,

"Nor any foreign earth of greater name
Can with sweet Italy contend in fame!"

No dragon's teeth were sown in its valleys. Its plains never bristled with helmets and warriors' thronging spears, but the olive and the vine gladden its fields. He lovingly numbers its monuments, its cities piled by the busy hands of man on beetling rocks; its rivers, gliding under ancient ramparts. How fair its streams and lakes, Clitumnus, Larius and Benacus, which in a single word the poet has immortalized. Above all, it is the land of heroes. Thence came the Sabine chivalry and the pikemen of the Volscian hills.

The poem is thoroughly Roman with its reverence for the Deity, its love of the fields, of country and home; its admiration for the simplicity and the manly virtues of the good old times. It is so virile, so true, the work of a great "landscape-lover" and "lord of language" unsurpassed when he sings "in the stateliest measure ever molded by the lips of man" of

Wheat and woodland, tilth and vineyard, hive and horse and
herd;
All the charm of all the Muses often flowering in a lonely
word.

The lessons of the "Georgics" are as needed today as when Augustus was endeavoring to bring back peace, prosperity and plenty to a disordered world.

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

THE WAYSIDE SHRINE

It fronts the beaten courses
Where weary feet go down
To join the flowing forces
Beyond the stricken town.
And they who pass in blindness
Nor mark thy loving face—
O Mary, in thy kindness,
Be thou their strength and grace!

The pointed roof is broken,
The empty vase is dry,
The statue all unspoken
Of thousands marching by.
The drooping wreath long faded;—
O Mary, make them thine,
Who pass so spent and jaded
Thy lonely wayside shrine!

HELEN MORIARTY.

REVIEWS

Hugo Grotius, the Father of the Modern Science of International Law. By HAMILTON VREELAND, JR. New York: Oxford University Press. \$2.00.

Mr. Vreeland should never have written this book. Grotius was far too great a man to have his biography undertaken by anyone so little conversant as is the author with the true history of Grotius's times. A mere text-book knowledge of the leading events of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is utterly insufficient for such a task. Moreover the slurs which Mr. Vreeland goes out of his way to cast upon the Popes and upon the Church prove in almost every instance to be mere adaptations of statements taken over from the works of Andrew D. White, undoubtedly the most notorious *manipulator* of history we have had since H. C. Lea.

For of all ascertained facts pertaining to the actual events of Grotius's career none stands out more dominantly than the life-long persecution he was made to suffer at the hands of Protestants on account of his leanings towards the Church and towards Catholic doctrines. When his work on *Antichrist* appeared in which he proved that the Popes were being slanderously accused by the Protestants his two most intimate friends among the latter, Salmasius and Vossius, turned against him. Furthermore his poem to the Blessed Virgin written in Latin, contains a fine eulogium of Urban VIII. The Reformation on the other hand was in his opinion a grave mistake nor could he see how unity and peace among Christians was to be re-established and maintained unless the Primacy of Peter were again acknowledged by all. The truest and most devoted friends he had were Catholics and with none was he on more intimate terms than with the Jesuit, Dionysius Petavius, one of the most eminent of the many noted Catholic theologians of his day.

It may be worth noting that, with a few possible exceptions only, there is not an accusation brought against the Popes by Mr. Vreeland that cannot be refuted from the works of Grotius himself. To give but an instance or two. Andrew D. White, in a highly ignorant account of the arbitral decision given by Alexander VI in 1493, a decision which concerned none but Spain and Portugal, misrepresents the facts. Mr. Vreeland in a passage in which he treats of Grotius's work "*De Mari Libero*" improves on this by maintaining that the lands discovered west and east of the line of demarcation were *given* respectively by the Pope to the two nations concerned. Grotius on the other hand in this very same treatise "*De Mari Libero*" shows most clearly that the Pope never did anything of the kind. At the very least therefore Mr. Vreeland might have consulted the wording of the Bull itself in which the decision was given. Again Mr. Vreeland asserts that the Popes almost forced Francis I to break his oath, whereas Grotius in the "*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*" points out the fact that the oath taken by the French King was null and void, which is no less than what the Pope himself maintained.

It is quite true that the "*De Jure Belli ac Pacis*" was put on the Index but only *donec corrigatur* and if Mr. Vreeland, instead of trusting to the prevarications of Andrew D. White, had only taken the trouble to find out the real reason why, he might have gained some valuable information both as regards the history and the principles of international law. No less an

authority than Mr. Albert de Lapradelle vouches for the fact that "Grotius had written the international law of absolutism" and that he "was led astray by his knowledge and worship of ancient authors." Many of the principles which he advocated are far and away behind those of the schoolmen who before his time had already treated the problem of international law, while his ambiguous enunciation of the natural law became the fountain-head of many of the errors we are now atoning for in the present war. The very fact that Gustavus Adolphus should have prized the work as he did is in itself a sufficient comment, since whatever the ground might be on which he would naturally approve of it the same would certainly come very near justifying the rulers of Prussia today both in their policies and in their methods of warfare.

In conclusion the reviewer challenges Mr. Vreeland to substantiate his assertion that the Popes stated that "No faith is to be kept with heretics." Should the author be able to trace this back to anything more reliable than the inventive brain of Andrew D. White the reviewer would be very grateful for the information, for he has long been looking for the latter's reference. Meanwhile both master and disciple could do nothing better than ponder for a quiet moment over the following words from Grotius: "Those who wish for an everlasting schism and who tremble at the very name of unity or of union in the Church are bound to represent the Pope as Antichrist. For once the schism were removed many would be left without a livelihood." M. I. X. M.

Cavalry of the Clouds. By CONTACT (CAPT. ALAN BOTT, M.C.), Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page & Co. \$1.40.

Over There and Back in Three Uniforms. By LIEUT. JOSEPH S. SMITH. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$1.50.

The first of these volumes is a book that takes us out of the trenches and up into the air, where we are enabled to see how the western front of the war-field looks from above. We are invited to be passengers on some daring flights over the enemy's lines, are attacked by German machines, have several hair-breadth escapes from death, see a number of our comrades fall headlong to destruction, and feel "the frozen hand of the atmosphere slap our face" at the icy altitude of 10,000 feet. We learn what the German anti-aircraft guns are like and become acquainted, at somewhat too intimate proximity, with the various branches of their family tree. "The family ghost," for example, appears without warning in the form of a pillar of white smoke, stretching to a height of several thousand feet. "It looks rigid as far as the top, where it sprays around into a knob. Altogether, it suggests a giant piece of asparagus; and fades away as suddenly as it arrived, after the manner of ghosts." The volume is a little vulgar and blasphemous at times, but, apart from these blemishes, is worth reading as a beginning of the "great tradition and noble chivalry" of the air.

"Over There and Back" is a book of memories of the war, some sad, some happy, but all portrayed with the vividness and keenness of actual participation. The writer is an American, born in Philadelphia, but who was a cowboy on a ranch in British Columbia when the war broke out. He enlisted in the Twenty-ninth Vancouver Battalion in Canada, and served under the British flag until August, 1917, when he resigned to put on the uniform of his own country. His account of the adventures he had is different from most of the war-books, and furnishes graphic pen-pictures that will grip the heart of all who have friends or relatives overseas. He writes as follows, for instance, about one of the regiment's first casualties: "What more could a real mother ask than to be the mother of a real man? She had told him when she said good-by: 'You are all my heart, Johnny. If you come back, I will be proud and happy. If you don't come back, well—I will be proud.' Thus did this mother of Canada give her son to the Empire." F. J. D.

Chronicles of St. Tid. By EDEN PHILLPOTTS. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

Simba. By STEWART EDWARD WHITE. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co. \$1.50.

The sixteen short stories in Mr. Phillpotts's latest book are marked by a high quality of literary workmanship. The scenes of the tales are Devon and the West Country which the author knows so well, and the characters that figure in the book are the folk of the slate mines. Every tale is so artistically narrated that the reader's interest seldom flags, a genial humor pervades the book, the men and women he describes are made of real flesh and blood, and the touches of dialect and the odd turns of expression heard in the parish of St. Tid's have been cleverly caught. "The Green Man" and "The Tiger," is a story that tells just why Widow Nute did not marry Matt Polwarr but Bart Keat instead; "The House in Two Parishes" tells how Parson White unwittingly kept Grandfather Jago from being buried alive; "The Rare Poppy" relates how two queer young people made a match; "The Reed Rond" tells how poor old Charity Bickford was driven to suicide; "The Saint and the Lovers" relates how a Popish saint furthered the "tokening" of Cherry and Sam, and the other stories in the book are almost as interesting as those named above.

"Simba," an African word for lion, is the name of a negro crown-prince who becomes the trusted gun-bearer of "Kingozi" an English elephant-hunter, and throughout the nine somewhat disconnected chapters in Mr. White's interesting book the young savage appears here and there. But the central figures in these tales of adventure are Kingozi, the old campaigner, Trelawney, the youthful governor, Lord Kilgour, the would-be sportsman, Captain Lewis, who opened hostilities on Captain Heine as soon as the news of the present war's outbreak reached the interior of Africa, and Seton and "Charley" Braxton, who made such a disastrous deal in cow ivory. W. D.

A Social History of the American Family. By ARTHUR W. CALHOUN, Ph.D. Vol. II. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co. \$5.00.

The second volume of Dr. Calhoun's work, which embraces the period from the end of the American Revolution to the close of the Civil War, exhibits the same defects and excellencies which characterized the first. It is only fair to say, that the two volumes give every evidence of industry and, in general, of an intelligent open-mindedness on the part of the author. These are excellent qualities; nevertheless, it is impossible to escape the impression that, from isolated instances Dr. Calhoun frequently draws conclusions which are far too sweeping. It is easy to find in the court records of a century ago or of today, a collection of cases which exhibit shocking violations of the natural and of the moral law. Clearly, however, it would be both illogical and unjust to conclude, forthwith, that the community in which these violations occurred was altogether corrupt. All such collections call for careful analysis and interpretation, if they are to have any social or historical significance. Thus, ten murders in one year might constitute an appalling criminal record for a small village, while in New York, so small a number would mark an improvement almost miraculous. This surely is an easy canon of sociological criticism; yet Dr. Calhoun does not appear to have taken it sufficiently into account in drawing up his black indictment of the social conditions which, as he claims, existed in many pioneer American communities. He fails to point out clearly the relative proportion of vice and virtue in the localities under investigation, and in this failure lies the chief defect of the work.

Incidentally, it may be noted that the author is often exceedingly inaccurate in his presentation of points of Catholic doctrine. Thus in the brief compass of two or three lines, he manages to present what is nothing short of a burlesque upon

the Church's position in regard to matrimony, and on birth-restriction. After so many centuries of controversy, it should be fairly clear, that the Church neither forbids nor forces any one to marry. Marriage is free, or it is not marriage. Furthermore, her condemnation of conscious birth-restriction affects only those forms of restriction which postulate a violation of the natural or of the Divine law. Restriction by mutual and free consent to abstinence, she not only allows, when all due moral safeguards are employed, but, in some cases, even counsels.

P. L. B.

Sea Dogs and Men at Arms. A Canadian Book of Songs. With Frontispiece in Colors. By JESSE EDGAR MIDDLETON. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. \$1.50.

The author of these poems has learned how to blend war and poetry melodiously. There is a genuine briny tang about his sea-songs and a fine martial swing to his soldier-lyrics as can be seen from the following stanzas from "Missing at Lloyd's" and "Dismounted":

Night, and a driving hissing snow
Dulling the lamps apart.
Night, and a million mocking waves,
Wild in their demon sport.
Spindrift whirling above the bridge,
Ice on the plates below.
We are strong, and the bunkers full,
Winds of the world may blow.

Our cavalry spurs are red with rust
And our bridle arm is stale,
We can but dream of the cut and thrust,
Of the flying charge or the saber lust,
And never a cavalry trumpet-gust
Goes shrilling upon the gale.

The author's attachment to the British Empire is musically expressed in such poems as "The Canadian" and "The Brotherhood"; the hidden heroism of naval engineers and submarine mechanics is sung in "The Engineer" and "The Nereid"; "Only Three" strikingly shows how cheap human life has now become; "The Mother" chants a tearful *Magnificat* because her boy lies slain in Flanders, and this poem is "Irony" indeed:

Out of the hill's eternal store
We brought the gift of God,
The orange drifts of iron ore
Leng hid beneath the sod.
From rocks as old as night and hell
Green-crusted copper came.
We forged the gun, the mine, the shell
And praised the Maker's name!

W. D.

A Russian Gentleman. By SERGE AKSAKOFF. Translated from the Russian by J. D. DUFF, Fellow of Trinity College, New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$2.25.

Those who read with interest this author's book about "A Russian Schoolboy" (Longmans), which was favorably noticed in our issue of last February 9, will find more entertaining still the volume under review. Mr. Aksakoff now tells all about his grandfather, Stepan Mihailovitch Bagroff, and the courtship and marriage of his own parents, as he had the story from them by word of mouth. Old Stepan Mihailovitch seems to have been a pretty difficult man to get on with, for he ruled his family like a savage Tartar, dragging his wife around by the hair when she ventured to protect their child who had angered him. The author's grandmother, he records, received more than one beating from her husband because she absolutely refused to supply him with anything but the coarsest linen. Even when "he took an axe and chopped up all his objectionable shirts," his wife "howled at the sight and implored him to beat *her* rather than spoil his good clothes." When the old Russian nobleman's rage had subsided, however, he was quite

gracious, would let the family kiss his hand, and would even deign to ask his wife how she had slept. "This question was a signal mark of favor," attests the author, "and my grandmother replied at once that, when Stepan Mihailovitch had a good night, she of course had one too."

Particularly interesting are the chapters describing the progress of the love affair that Alexyéi Stepanitch, the only son of the house of Bagroff, carried on with Sofya Nikolayevna Zubin, a fair maiden of Ufa, his inferior in birth, but his better by far in breeding and education. Alexyéi's feminine kin did their best to break off the match, and he secured his domineering father's consent to marry Sofya only by threatening to commit suicide. The interval between the young couple's engagement day and the morning of the wedding was by no means free from difficulties and complications. But at last they were permanently married and on their honeymoon, paid, though with grave misgivings, a ceremonious visit to Bagrovo, where the groom's truculent father lived. The bride won the old barbarian's heart at once, however, and completed the conquest by getting up and joining him on the stoop where he was accustomed daily to watch the sun rise. So he took Sofya's part against all his intriguing womankind and gave her besides some good advice about how to keep her husband's respect and love.

Very entertaining too are the pages describing the bridal party's visit to Alexandra Karatayeff's, where the newcomers were almost devoured by night-prowling rats; the pages telling how Sofya adroitly continued her stupid husband's education; and those which relate what tyrannic power servants sometimes exercised in an eighteenth-century Russian household, and how brutally the serfs were often treated. The first baby born to Sofya and Alexyéi, an unwelcome girl, died in infancy, but subsequently a little heir came to the house of Bagroff, and when the joyful news was brought Stepan Mihailovitch, the old man first crossed himself, then "sprang out of bed, went barefoot to his desk, snatched from it the family tree, took the pen from the ink-bottle, drew a line from the circle containing the name Alexyéi, traced a fresh circle at the end of the line, and wrote in the center of the circle, Serghei," the name of the boy, who lived to be the author of this excellent book.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

For those who are planning a service-flag celebration, the Rev. Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., has published a song to the music of "The Top of the Morning." Copies of the words and music are for sale on application to Holy Cross College, Worcester.—During the Christmas time, Fischer & Bro. published "*Gesu Bambino*," a sacred song by Pietro Yon. The anthem is built upon a phrase of the "*Adeste Fidelis*," and this, together with its general composition, makes it redolent of Yuletide. It can be effectively used by a solo voice, as also by boys' voices in unison.—The B. Herder Book Co. have published in a convenient form and at the price of \$2.00 an organ accompaniment prepared by Victor Winter, S.J., for the "Students' Mass Book and Hymnal," compiled by Rev. W. B. Sommerhauser.

"Tales from a Famished Land" (Doubleday, \$1.25), by Edward Eyre Hunt, "Miss Pim's Camouflage" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50), by Lady Stanley, "Conscript—2989" (Dodd, Mead, \$1.00), and "Blown in by the Draft" (Doubleday, \$1.25), by Frazier Hunt, are four recent books bearing on the war. The first is made up of fourteen stories told by an American who served on the Commission of Relief in Belgium. He says they "are not strictly truth," and "not fiction," but "both." The mixture is not very satisfactory, but the background of the stories gives a good picture of war-riven Belgium. Miss Pim, a middle-aged English woman, has the gift of making herself invisible, so the military

authorities send her to spy on the Germans. It is not much of a story. The other two volumes describe the making of our new American soldiers. "Conscript—2989," which H. B. Martin illustrates, is the amusing diary of a "rookie" from the day of his reaching camp till he goes south. "Blown in by the Draft" is an entertaining collection of "camp yarns," illustrating how civilians turn into soldiers.

The late Donald Hankey's purpose in writing "Religion and Common Sense" (Dutton, \$0.60), was perhaps as orthodox as that which set the Angelic Doctor to writing the "*Summa contra Gentiles*." He had read rationalistic books and saw how the whole fabric of Christianity and the supernatural was being torn and hacked by the "higher" critics. He must answer the rationalist and win the day for Christ. His method would be ludicrous were there not a certain pathos which attaches to the posthumous utterances of a man in such evident good faith. He answers all the rationalistic vapors about comparative mythology, the absurdity of the Resurrection, the impossibility of the Virgin Birth and miracles by declaring that all such discussions are simple beside the point. According to the author, we approach the Gospels not to study Jesus as we find Him in historical books, but to find a character which sums up certain feelings of the common conscience of mankind. This sounds very much like the Modernistic definition of the Church. All will go well, if only we believe. Just what we are to believe seems to be of secondary importance. Of course, faith with him is fiducial. The book is only another striking proof that modern Protestantism is tantamount to a Christless Christianity.

It will be hard even for the most callous reader to go through the "*Impressions de Guerre de Prêtres Soldats*" (Paris: Plon-Nourrit.) collected and edited in two volumes by Léonce de Grandmaison without a growing admiration for the splendid sacrifices and the chivalrous devotion manifested at every stage of the thrilling and martial episodes which they record. The soldier-priests from whose notes and letters the various incidents which make up the volume are taken were in the closest contact in the trenches, in the hospitals, in the charge and the attack with the soldiers whose deeds and heroism and glorious deaths are here described. From every source available the editor has given us a pen-picture unsurpassed in reality and picturesqueness of the French fighting man, and his splendid officers and chiefs. The soldier-priests depict for us in these pages, all written with a rare distinction and refinement of thought and style, the soul of the French armies. Everywhere in their gallant regiments there is evidence of a wonderful revival of faith and piety. That is undoubtedly one of the reasons of the heroism and the devotion displayed by the men of Verdun and their companions in arms. Unconsciously also the soldier-priests who record their impressions in these pages have painted their own souls and their own spirit. The whole world knows at the present moment that these are in every respect worthy of their own high calling and of the heroic men by whose side they have fought and prayed.

The following poem, entitled "The Wayfarer," was written by Padraic H. Pearse while he was imprisoned in Kilmainham Jail, May, 1916, awaiting execution for his part in the Easter week uprising. The lines are taken from the "Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse." (Stokes, \$3.00).

The beauty of the world hath made me sad,
This beauty that will pass;
Sometimes my heart hath shaken with great joy
To see a leaping squirrel in a tree,
Or a red lady-bird upon a stalk,
Or little rabbits in a field at evening,
Lit by a slanting sun,
Or some green hill where shadows drifted by,
Some quiet hill where mountainy man hath sown

And soon would reap; near to the gate of Heaven;
Or children with bare feet upon the sands
Of some ebb'd sea, or playing on the streets
Of little towns in Connacht,
Things young and happy.
And then my heart hath told me;
These will pass,
Will pass and change, will die and be no more,
Things bright and green, things young and happy;
And I have gone upon my way
Sorrowful.

The verses in Cale Young Rice's "Wraiths and Realities" (\$1.25), or in Alice Duer Miller's "Wings in the Night," two books recently published by the Century Co., contain little that is of permanent value. Mr. Rice relates in verse two short stories which would have been better in prose and there is an unpleasant note of skepticism in many of his lyrics. "Chansons of the Bells of Oseney," much of which has already been quoted in AMERICA, is the finest poem in the volume. The best things in Miss Miller's book are her stanzas on "The Stars" and the following tribute to "An American to France":

O France, with what a shamed and sorry smile,
We now recall that in a bygone day
We sought of you art, wit, perfection, style,
You were to us a playground and a play.
Paris was ours—its sudden green edged spaces,
And sweeping vistas to the coming night,
Brocades and jewels, porcelains and laces—
All these we took for leisure and delight.
And all the time we should have drunk our fill
Of wisdom known to you and you alone,
Clear-eyed self-knowledge, silent courage, will;
And now too late, we see these things are one:
That art is sacrifice and self-control,
And who loves beauty must be stern of soul.

Though Mother St. Paul's "*Passio Christi*, Meditations" for Lent" (Longmans, \$1.40) reached this country too late to be seasonable, it is a good book to keep in mind for next year. Ignatian meditations on the sacred Passion, with preludes, two or three points, "colloquy," "resolution" and "spiritual bouquet" are set for each day of Lent, and Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., furnishes the volume with a preface.—"Au Cœur de Jésus Agonisant" (Téqui, 2 fr.), by J. Darguad is a collection of twelve meditations on the Holy Hour in which the author conforms to the more exact interpretation of an "hour of prayer in union with the prayer of the Saviour in the Garden of Olives on Maunday Thursday night." The meditations are colloquial in form, and full of unction and devotion, the intention being that the one praying should be immediately united in spirit with the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The book has become the vademecum of the members of the Archconfraternity of the Holy Hour in the church of the Monastery of the Visitation at Paray-le-Monial, the convent-home of Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque.

The following stanzas on "The Connaught Rangers" are contributed by Miss W. M. Letts to the current *Yale Review*:

I saw the Connaught Rangers when they were passing by,
On a spring day, a good day, with gold rifts in the sky.
Themselves were marching steadily along the Liffey quay
An' I see the young proud look of them as if it was today!
The bright lads, the right lads, I have them in my mind,
With the green flags on their bayonets all fluttering in the wind!

A last look at old Ireland, a last good-bye maybe,
Then the gray sea, the wide sea, my grief upon the sea!
And when will they come home, says I, when will they see
once more
The dear blue hills of Wicklow and Wexford's dim gray
shore?
The brave lads of Ireland, no better lads you'll find,
With the green flags on their bayonets all fluttering in the
wind!

Three years have passed since that spring day, sad years for them and me.

Green graves there are in Serbia and in Gallipoli.

And many who went by that day along the muddy street
Will never hear the roadway ring to their triumphant feet.

But when they march before Him, God's welcome will be kind,

And the green flags on their bayonets will flutter in the wind.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- American Book Co., New York:**
 Chemistry in the Home. By Henry T. Weed, B.S. \$1.20. Laboratory Manual of Chemistry in the Home. By Henry T. Weed. \$0.44. Practical English for High Schools. By William D. Lewis, A.M., and James Fleming Hosc, Ph.D. \$1.00. Elementary Spanish Grammar. By Aurelio M. Essinosa, Ph.D., and Clifford G. Allen, Ph.D. \$1.24. Le Premier Livre. By Albert A. Mérés, Ph.D., and B. Mérés, A.M. \$0.64. A Community Arithmetic. By Brenelle Hunt. \$0.60. A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges. By Herbert Weir Smyth, Ph.D. \$1.50. An Introduction to Science. By Bertha M. Clark, Ph.D. \$1.20. Laboratory Manual for Introduction to Science. By Bertha M. Clark, Ph.D. \$0.44. The First Spanish Book, After the Natural or Direct Method, for Schools and Self-Instruction. By James H. Worman, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D. \$0.48.
- Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris:**
 Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique. Sous la Direction de A. D'Alès. Fascicule XIV. Mariolâtrie—Modernisme.
- Benziger Brothers, New York:**
 The Man From Nowhere. By Anna T. Sadlier. \$1.00; The Straight Religion. By Father Benedict, O.S.S.S. With a Foreword by Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J. \$1.50.
- Bloud et Gay, Paris:**
 Who was Responsible for the War? By Senator Tommaso Tittoni; The Church of France During the War. By Georges Goyau.
- Samuel Byrne, 420 N. Highland Ave., Pittsburg, Pa.:**
 Silken Thomas, an Irish Historical Drama. Period 1535-37. By Samuel Byrne. \$1.00.
- The Century Company, New York:**
 Roving and Fighting: Adventures under Four Flags. By Major Edward S. O'Reilly. Illustrated with Photographs. \$2.00; Film Folk: "Close-ups" of the Men, Women and Children Who Make the "Movies." By Bob Wagner. Illustrated with Photographs. \$2.00.
- Dodd, Mead & Co., New York:**
 Poems: 1908-1914. By John Drinkwater. \$1.25.
- E. P. Dutton & Co., New York:**
 Foster on Auction. A Complete Exposition of the Latest Developments of Modern Auction. By R. S. Foster. \$2.00; Use Your Government: What Your Government Does for You. By Alissa Franc. \$2.00; The Unwilling Vestal: a Tale of Rome under the Caesars. By Edward Lucas James. \$1.50; Economy Cook Book. By Mary McIlvaine Gilmore. \$1.00.
- Harper & Brothers, New York:**
 The Real Front. By Arthur Hunt Chute, Late First Canadian Division. \$1.50; Outwitting the Hun. By Lieut. Pat. O'Brien, Royal Flying Corps. Illustrated. \$1.50.
- B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis:**
 A Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy. By Cardinal Mercier and Professors of the Higher Institute of Philosophy, Louvain. Authorized Translation and Eighth Edition. By T. L. Parker, M.A., and S. A. Parker, O.S.B., M.A., with a Preface by P. Coffey, Ph.D. Vol. II, Natural Theology (Theodicy) Logic, Ethics, History of Philosophy. With Facsimile Letter. \$3.50; The Story of St. Patrick's Purgatory. By Shane Leslie. \$0.50.
- Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston:**
 The Melody of Earth: Anthology of Garden and Nature Poems from Present-day Poets. Selected and Arranged by Mrs. Waldo Richards. \$1.50; Miss Pim's Camouflage. By Lady Stanley. \$1.50.
- P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York:**
 The Origins of Contemporary Psychology. By Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines. Translated by W. H. Mitchell, M.A. \$2.25.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:**
 The Outrage. By Annie Vivanti Chartres. \$1.35; National Miniatures. By "Tatler." \$1.50; Martin Rivas. By Alberto Blest-Gana. Translated from the Spanish by Mrs. Charles Whitham. \$1.60; Singing Carr and Other Song-Ballads of the Cumberland. By William Aspinwall Bradley. \$0.75.
- La Salle Extension University, Chicago:**
 The Employment Department and Employee Relations. By F. C. Henderschott and T. E. Weakly.
- J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia:**
 Death, Virtues and Exploits of General George Washington. By Mason L. Weems. \$1.50.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York:**
 Education: Selective, Specific, Compensatory. By Michael West, Indian Educational Service. With a Foreword by Hon. Mr. W. W. Hornell. \$1.25; Christianity and Immortality. By Vernon F. Storr, M.A. \$2.50.
- The Macmillan Co., New York:**
 Toward the Gulf. By Edgar Lee Masters. \$1.50; Criminology. By Maurice Parmelee, Ph.D. \$2.00.
- A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago:**
 Holding the Line. By Sergeant Harold Baldwin, of the First Division, Canadian Expeditionary Forces. With Illustrations and Diagrams. \$1.50.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:**
 Georgian Poetry: 1916-1917. \$2.00.
- Charles Scribner's Sons, New York:**
 "Over There" with the Australians. By Captain R. Hugh Knyvett, Anzac Scout, Intelligence Officer, Fifteenth Australian Infantry. \$1.50; The Flower of the Chapdelaines. By George W. Cable. \$1.35; The Ways of War. By Professor T. M. Kettle, Lieut. 9th Dublin Fusileer, With a Memoir by His Wife, Mary S. Kettle. \$1.50.
- Sturgis & Walton Co., New York:**
 Universal Service, the Hope of Humanity. By L. H. Bailey. \$1.25.
- The Stratford Company, Boston:**
 Nine Humorous Tales. By Anton Chekhov. Translated by Isaac Goldberg and Henry T. Schnitkind. \$0.25.
- Mary Immaculate Press, San Antonio, Texas:**
 In the Shadow of the Alamo: a Garland of Lyrics for San Antonio's Bicentenary, 1918. By Paul A. Lewis, O.M.I. \$0.40.
- Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn.**
 The Method of Henry James. By Joseph Warren Beach, Associate Professor of English, University of Minnesota. \$2.00.

EDUCATION

Notes on Oral English

AN essential condition for a correct use of the mother-tongue is a ready knowledge of grammar. Some schools really teach grammar while others have the reputation of teaching it, whereas they hardly teach it at all. The excellence which the pupils display is due to home-training. Furthermore, some schools which are really making an intensive effort to impart a good training in this important subject are often accused of negligence, because their work is impaired by home conditions and by the general surroundings of the pupils. It may be worth while to examine these phenomena. They explain, at least in part, the contradictory opinions so often expressed, as to the value of formal grammar in the teaching of composition, whether written or oral.

WHY FORMAL GRAMMAR?

WHERE formal grammar has been industriously pursued without a seemingly adequate return, there is a strong temptation to turn to the language-lesson, or to something which seems to promise better practical results. Where formal grammar has been skimmed, there is a lack of exactitude and certainty, even where there is, in general, correctness in expression. This inexactitude and uncertainty manifest themselves especially in high school and college, wherever there is question of acquiring a foreign language. The result of this manifestation is a clamor for more formal grammar.

Here as in everything else we must cleave to the golden mean. We should give a considerable amount of formal grammar, and we should make formal grammar fruitful of good by a very considerable amount of practical application. In etymology, for instance, we ought to drill, I insist on the word *drill*, classes in the verb. We should drill them in the different voices, the different tenses, the different forms of the same tense. I know that many exponents of modern pedagogy object to drill, on the score that it is work, and that school should be play. I have no patience with these innovators. School is a preparation for life, and life is work. This does not mean that I would advocate grammar for grammar's sake. I would advocate grammar for composition's sake. With this end in view I would eliminate everything but the essentials. Nice questions of purely technical value I would relegate to specialists.

WRITING AND SPEAKING

THE principle which should guide us in the selection of matter from theoretical grammar should be *non multa, sed multum*, "not much, but muchly," if I may use the term. The "muchly" I would understand as constant insistence on a few essential principles. You have the parts of the verbs. Insist that they be used correctly. "I have saw," "I seen," "I have did," "I done," and the like mistakes in etymology which daily jar on our ears must be corrected, constantly, relentlessly, till the very look cast at an offender will notify him of his fault. You have taught the rules of syntax. Then, and even before, begin the war on "It ain't done," "you was," "them fellows." You have taught the analysis of sentences, the theory, and the practice. Reverse the process, and make it fruitful in the line of composition by teaching sentence-synthesis. The final purpose of all the English precepts of the primary school should, I think, be the power to write and to speak a grammatical sentence.

It is not likely that, ordinarily, there will be much facility in the speaking of a sentence without considerable practice in writing. There should be a daily theme in sentence-structure. It may be the amplification of a sentence by the addition of words, of phrases or of clauses; it may be the synthesis of several sentences into one; it may be the expansion of an assigned topic into a sentence of an indicated form. The determination of these details of the theme may be left to the inclination and

discretion of the teacher. The theme should, however, be adapted to the grades of the pupils, and even in the same grade be so graduated as to be a progressive exercise.

ENGLISH IN EVERY CLASS

IT must not be imagined that, because pupils can write a sentence, they can speak one trippingly on the tongue. Writing is a preparation and a help to speech, but it is not speech. There must be exercise, and a great deal of it, in oral composition. Nor is this exercise to be confined to the English hour. It must be extended to other classes; in *all* classes, attention must be paid to expression. But we must be reasonable in what we expect in classes other than English. A teacher cannot halt a class in history or arithmetic to give a lesson in English. All that can be done is to correct a mistake, or to straighten out a construction, and this, with the least possible interruption to the subject in hand. But while we put these limitations on this matter of English instruction, we do not mean to limit instruction to class-hours and class-times. Here, as in pronunciation, the teacher may with profit teach even on the playground or in the recreation-hall. The help given to expression outside of the English hour, will probably be especially notable in the matter of vocabulary. Speech, even merely correct speech, is impossible without a fitting supply of words. How to equip the child with a suitable vocabulary is, by reason of conditions in American life, often a problem which is left altogether to the teacher to solve.

GETTING A VOCABULARY

THE children who attend our schools may come from homes where the standard of information and conversation is such that they become possessed of a vocabulary without any conscious effort. In the majority of cases, however, our children come from homes where they can never gather a vocabulary, either because in these homes there is no English at all, or because the English spoken is deficient in quality. This lack of vocabulary these children usually piece out with slang. There is no gainsaying that much of American slang is picturesque; neither can it be denied that it is often a very effective method of expression. In saying this, I am merely quoting the opinion of a distinguished Englishman, who some years back paid a prolonged visit to the States. Unhappily, the efficiency of American slang is shortlived. The slang term, which covers a multitude of ideas today, tomorrow is expressive of nothing. A slang term is usually not a permanent addition to vocabulary. Its efficiency is frequently due to its blanket quality, which does not contribute to that precision of expression which is essential in correctness of speech.

Slang must be tabooed. An English vocabulary must be substituted. What can be done by the parish school in this direction? In a high school you can assign reading to be covered outside of class, and you can, by demanding word-lists, and by set tests, compel pupils to investigate the meaning of new words, and to add them to their vocabulary. Work of the same kind may be done in the higher grades of the parish school, but it does not seem to me to be very practicable in the lower grades. In these lower grades, I think the gathering of a vocabulary will have to be largely, if not altogether, a matter of class-work. The teacher will insist on the meaning of words and must be prepared to explain the simplest terms, because the vocabulary of the ordinary child is extremely limited. Words once learned may be worked into sentences, either written or oral, and the endeavor, both in written and oral composition, must be toward making new words a part of the child's living vocabulary. Here, too, as in other efforts toward correct speech, there must be insistence on the purpose intended in every place and at every turn. What degree of precision in vocabulary is attainable, cannot be determined with mathematical precision.

Common-sense would seem to indicate that in this the grammar or parish school can make only a beginning. Precision in expression is a life-work.

AN ENCOURAGING OUTLOOK

FOR whatever they may accomplish in this line, however, we should be grateful to the teachers in our parish schools. A little thankfulness may be some compensation for the failure which frequently seems to be the reward of their labors. It has been remarked by some directors of parish schools that the efforts of their teachers, especially in English, go sadly to waste. The boy or girl who leaves the parish school, fairly correct in the use of the mother tongue, loses in the factory, or in the store, or in later companionship, the fruit of devoted instruction.

"Love's labor lost"! Still we seem to be coming to better things. The art of vocal expression, some years ago, was hardly recognized as an element in higher education. There were even colleges which neglected it. Men were to be equipped with illimitable stores of information, but were to receive no training in the method of expressing it by word of mouth. Today we live in a new order. Public speaking has its place in high schools and colleges. The professions recognize that their members should have some ability in the gentle art. The dental schools of the country have inaugurated their four years' course, and I have been informed that some practice in public speaking has a place in it. Business men have for some years back seen the advantages of capacity in speech. They have been taking lessons in voice-culture, not to fit themselves for the platform, but in order to acquire a finish of expression which will increase their efficiency. Oral expression has a future. It should engage at least some part of every teacher's attention, whether in the grammar school or the university.

JOHN P. McNICHOLS, S.J.

ECONOMICS

Economic Versus Political Democracy

MINIMUM-WAGE and labor disputations have often developed the distinction between economic and political democracy, but the phraseology is comparatively recent. While peace conferences may adjudicate political democracy as an international problem, peace terms will not settle the internal domestic problems which will follow in the wake of the war. One of the first of these will be that of social and industrial reconstruction, or briefly stated, economic democracy. Already our Government has named a commission to develop a healthy policy with respect to labor, now and after the war. The President's Mediation Commission has successfully opened the copper mines in Arizona, quelled the unrest in the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest, and averted the threatened strikes in the oil fields of southern California, the strike partly executed on the telephone lines of the Pacific States, and the threatened tie-up of the packing industry centered in Chicago. Again, the labor troubles in our Eastern shipyards were successfully remedied.

THE GUARANTEES OF DEMOCRACY

ON the other side of the world, the Russian Bolsheviks profess to be less interested in political than in economic democracy. The British Labor party, under the leadership of Arthur Henderson, a former member of the British War Cabinet under Lloyd George, has launched its program for an industrial democracy in England. Quite recently through a report upon reconstruction made by a sub-committee, it has given the world an economic program that demands the attention of all economists and others interested in human welfare. The labor interests of the other Allies are also more or less well organized, and together with British labor present a very formidable front to reconstruction problems that will come after the war.

Political democracy guarantees the self-determination of a people through plebiscite, provides a representative system of government with majority rule coincident with the recognition of minority and individual rights, and extends suffrage to its electorate, irrespective of creed, race, property, wealth, or hereditary tests. With women playing so large and important a part in the prosecution of the war at home, it is only fair that a further test, that of sex, be removed. Political democracy, quite naturally, cannot bestow the full and proper degree of material prosperity as between all individuals except, in so far as healthy political institutions affect abundant production of wealth, and the equitable distribution of the resultant social dividend.

And it is in the equitable distribution of the social dividend that economic democracy begins and ends. Economic democracy does not mean equality of income, nor even equality of opportunity. It precludes Socialism, since a State bureaucracy would even suspend man's inalienable right to labor or not to labor; negative the right to strike, labor's most potent weapon in collective bargaining; deny the liberty of investing wages or savings, so as to accrue rent, interest, or profits; destroy the incentives for initiative and saving; reduce the sum-total of operative capital equipment, with a consequent reduction in production; and finally, fail to accumulate a sufficient social income even to "go around" under any system of distribution, utopian or otherwise.

"ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY" INTERPRETED

ON the contrary, what society wants and needs is more production of wealth, a greater volume of economic goods, more capital equipment per worker. A shorter day and greater pay are ultimately economically inoperative, unless the worker can add a correlative increment to production, either through increased efficiency resulting from a refreshed mind and body, or through a more extensive application of machinery per unit of labor. Otherwise higher wages only become an aggravating factor in raising commodity price levels, and energizing the "vicious economic circle" which calls for still further wage increases and the repetition of the cumulative progression upwards. In the final analysis, I believe economic democracy, correctly interpreted, means "distributive justice," if I may use the words of a distinguished Catholic economist. The British Labor party's reconstruction program would seem to confirm this interpretation. The four "pillars" designed to support its socio-economic structure, and on which I shall comment in a following article, apparently constitute, with some important revisions, a feasible economic mechanism, capable of effecting a more scientific and equitable distribution of wealth than now prevails. While intrinsically sound, our present system does not direct the various shares now going to land, labor, capital, and the entrepreneur in the full and proper proportions, so as to conduce to universal human well-being. Especially is this true respecting unskilled labor. War and rising living costs have only emphasized the social madadjustments for which not a few corrective programs have been advanced. Socialism is omnipresent with its specifics, but Socialism would shortly develop into State tyranny and State absolutism. British labor has promulgated its program, and our own Federal Government has constituted a commission to outline an industrial and labor policy. In its report, this commission counsels the creation of a National War Labor Board.

RUSSIAN SOCIALISM

SOCIALISM as sponsored by Bolshevism, both in its economic and political aspects, will first be reviewed. The Socialist party in Russia consists of the majority faction, the Bolsheviks or Maximalists, and the minority faction, the Mensheviks or Minimalists. Lenine was and is now leading the former element, while Kerensky and the "intellectual" Socialists represented the latter. The Minimalists are the practical Socialists. They be-

lieve in effecting reforms gradually even through the instrumentality of existing political parties and economic institutions. They anticipate the millennium only in the distant future. Kerensky's party alone recognized Russia's proper relations to her Allies and determined to fight autocracy first and then institute reforms at home. Lenine and Trotzky, as spokesmen for the Bolsheviks, reversed the process. Opposing Kerensky because he failed to give Russia a peace at any price, they disorganized the industrial organization at home and ordered an armistice and demobilization on the eastern front. The bourgeoisie were dispossessed, wealth expropriated, bank funds transferred or simply stolen, industry slackened and the channels of distribution actually dammed. In fact, their economic warfare was so extended that everybody who had ever saved a dollar was deemed bourgeois and as possessing no rights worthy of recognition. Such is the Bolshevik idea of industrial democracy.

BOLSHEVIKI IN AMERICA

THE Russian fiasco is consummated. How that benighted land ever hopes to achieve political democracy, the forerunner of industrial democracy, while it remains the footstool of the Kaiser has not been explained. The world must first be made "safe for democracy" politically, only after this can industrial and social reconstruction begin. The Russian Bolsheviks seem to have forgotten this; the American "Bolsheviks," Nearing, Berger and other "intellectuals," are blind to it. Spargo, Russell and other leaders of the orphaned American Socialist party, through their disaffection with their former political allegiance, most emphatically confirm this fact. America has extended her sympathy to a misled people seeking to become masters of their own destiny, and also to encourage Russia in the fight against the common foe. Our country expresses the same solicitude for the people of Russia now under the dominance of Germany as she does for unfortunate Belgium, Northern France, Serbia and Roumania. Nevertheless, the awful penalty for the failure of Russia experimentalists is being paid by America and the Allies. The American and British laborer and the French peasant are being opposed in hand to hand combat on the western front by Teutonic hordes released through the Bolshevik perfidy. The Central Powers through peace arrangements with Roumania and the Ukraine, have removed the last vestiges of fear of starvation, so that now we can no longer hope to bring Germany to submission through any economic blockade. The small French bourgeoisie, noted for their thrift and frugality, will largely lose their savings now invested in Russian loans, unless a responsible Russia guarantees them; and finally, Russia, split into several quasi-independent States, is doomed to supply Germany with the human munitions and provisions for future wars, unless we are victorious.

We have our Bolsheviks in this country, nominally posing as the champions of our "exploited classes." They, too, would "fight" the Kaiser with platitudes; they, too, are urging a desultory prosecution and even cessation of the war, by striving to undermine the morale of our citizenship and military forces; just at the time relentless German might stalks about unconquered on the battlefields of Europe. A peace with such a Germany drunk with military success, would be most premature and, for a free country, shameful. It would involve the recognition of German world-mastery, the forfeiture of democracy in its most vital forms, the political and economic tyranny of a military caste, and indemnities severe enough to conscript the savings of the humblest workman in America. And such a peace would result as surely as the machinations of the Russian dreamer, playing into the hands of a shrewd German diplomacy, forced Russia to sign a degrading pact. Far from achieving political democracy, the Bolsheviks have only made the struggle of the free nations the more difficult. With German autocracy rampant, freedom, both industrial and political, is impossible.

JOHN J. WAGNER.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Our Men in France

IT is delightful to read Father Coakley's impressions of our American soldiers at the front, as described in a letter published in the *Pittsburgh Observer*. After his first week's experience with our army in France he wrote:

The character of the men is a revelation. Perhaps I should not say this, but I had heard so much from inexperienced persons as to what to expect in the army, that the realization is a grateful surprise. I have been in this camp for nearly a week, associating with the officers and men intimately, at meals, in the field, at instruction camps, at lectures, in all places, and I have found as high and as generous natures and as noble characters as I have ever found in my life. In quarters where one would least expect it, one finds unsullied innocence, the sound mind in the sound body, men keen, alert, fresh, active, intelligent, bubbling over with enthusiasm, working hard and with no time for the sordid things of life. I have heard less profanity, for instance, during the last week at this camp than I could hear any day on the streets of Pittsburgh, which, to me at least, proves that the fine flower of chivalry still blooms fair and lovely in the American army.

So far as the chaplains themselves are concerned, says Father Coakley, everything possible is done by the officers to facilitate their work. Orderlies are at their disposal, announcements are read out at camp gatherings, and the brigade and regiment bands are gladly offered for religious services.

The New Food Regulations

A REDUCTION of our monthly consumption of wheat from 42,000,000 to 21,000,000 bushels, or fully one-half, is described by the Food Administration as an "essential provision." This would leave approximately a pound and a half of wheat products for each person per week. The new rules, with which a voluntary compliance is expected, may thus be briefly summarized:

(1) Householders shall not use more than one pound and a half of wheat products per person each week. (2) Hotels and clubs shall observe two wheatless days per week as at present, and in addition shall not serve to any one guest at one meal breadstuffs containing in the aggregate more than two ounces of wheat flour; nor shall they serve any wheat products unless specially ordered. (3) Retailers shall not sell more than one-eighth of a barrel of flour to any town customer at one time, nor more than one-quarter barrel to a country customer, and in no case shall they sell wheat products without selling an equal weight of other cereals. (4) Bakers and grocers are asked to reduce the victory bread sold by delivery from a one pound loaf to a three-quarter pound loaf. The same proportions are to be observed in other weights. (5) Manufacturers using wheat products for non-food purposes shall cease such use entirely. (6) No limit is placed upon the use of other cereals, flours and meals, etc.

It is hoped that with the arrival of harvest these restrictions may be relaxed. The suggestion is made that those who can afford to substitute other products should strive to forego the use of wheat entirely, thus leaving a margin for the poor who are dependent upon bakeries and unable easily to readjust their diet.

Self-Denial and the Liberty Loan

THE virtue of self-denial is earnestly urged by the Government in connection with the purchase of Liberty Loan Bonds. Aside from all supernatural motives, the following purely natural reasons are deserving of consideration. The American citizen who, instead of spending a given sum for articles that are not strictly necessary, denies himself and lends the money to the Government performs a two-fold service. In

the first place he provides the country with the sinews of war. In the second he relieves to that same extent the drain on our "goods and services." In other words, he saves all the labor that would be required for the manufacture of the articles he wished to buy, and in addition allows so much more freight space for Government needs. Thus by his sacrifice he has left at the disposal of the country a certain amount of material, a certain amount of labor, and a certain amount of transportation facilities. When millions of other citizens pursue this same course we can understand what it will mean to the country at large. It implies a loan of millions of dollars, a supply of tremendous quantities of material, and free space in hundreds of thousands of cars left entirely at the Government's disposal. Hence the reason for urging thrift and self-denial in connection with the War-Savings Stamps and the Liberty Loan.

Mailing Parcels to American Expeditionary Forces

IT is important that attention be called to the new postal regulations dealing with the mailing of parcels to members of the American Expeditionary Forces abroad. Postmasters are not permitted to accept for mailing any articles addressed to such members unless sent at the written request of the soldier or other individual connected with these forces. Such requests must further have the approval of the regimental or higher commander, or of an executive officer of the organization to which the addressee is attached. Postmasters are ordered to secure in each case the assurance of the sender that all the articles contained in the parcel are sent at the addressee's approved written request. This must be inclosed in the parcel and the sender must place, under his name and address, the following indorsement on the wrapper of the parcel: "This parcel contains only articles sent at approved request of addressee, which is inclosed." The new orders and instructions are issued at the request of the War Department. Express and freight companies are bound by the same regulations.

Bishop Russell on the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A.

IN the *Charleston Evening Post* for March 13, a clear statement is offered by Bishop Russell relative to the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. Non-Catholics cannot fail to appreciate the force of his argument. He had been asked to make an address in behalf of a Y. W. C. A. campaign, and in declining the invitation explained that he did not refuse his assistance because these organizations were Protestant. Were they frankly to profess themselves such and ask his cooperation in any philanthropic work he would be pleased to comply. But it was not possible to do so when they called themselves Christian, and at the same time implied by their constitution that Catholics cannot be comprehended under that term, but are nothing more in their eyes than infidels. He, therefore, could not join forces with them without insulting his own Church. Here is the pith of the Bishop's argument, which members of the Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. can readily comprehend by placing themselves in our position:

Both these organizations call themselves Christian. At the same time their constitutions exclude Catholics, the largest Christian body in the world, from active membership. Catholics, it is true, may become members, but only on a par with the infidel, the Mormon or the Mohammedan. I am a Christian. Consequently, I cannot affiliate in any way with an organization which, while professing to be Christian, says to me by the provisions of its constitution: "You are not a Christian."

It is the Bishop's suggestion that both these associations should squarely place themselves before the public as "Protestant evangelical associations." This would change the Y. M.

C. A. into Y. M. P. A. and no offence could be taken by Catholics. "They should change their name or their constitution." We would quite readily cooperate with any Protestant organization in any plan for the good of the community, he adds, "but we cannot do so without stultifying ourselves so long as these organizations refuse to recognize us as Christians."

American Jews Pay Tribute to John Redmond

A MARKED copy of the *American Israelite* was sent to us containing the following tribute to the memory of John Redmond:

It is not only the Irish people who have lost an ardent champion through the death of John Redmond, for so many years the brave and intelligent leader of the Irish Parliamentary party. The Jews the world over have through the passing of John Redmond been deprived of a sincere and whole-souled friend, who at the time of the fearful massacres at Kishineff and elsewhere, directed the attention of the world to the barbarities and atrocities which were being committed in Russia and so stirred the conscience of the civilized nations that a universal protest put an end, at least temporarily, to the outrages. Nor was John Redmond silent when even in his own country there were those who sought to soil Ireland's record of never having persecuted Jews, and a malicious attack was made upon the good name of the Jews of Ireland by the Limerick Confraternity. It was John Redmond, backed by all decent and fair-minded Irishmen, who put an end to the agitation.

For these reasons the Jews wish their gratitude to be placed upon record and to be "counted among the mourners for John Redmond."

Latest Catholic Statistics for the United States

IN his recent statistics of church-membership in the United States, Dr. H. K. Carroll remarked:

The Roman Catholic Church added to its numbers in 1916 nearly 390,000 estimated communicants; the editor of the "Official Catholic Directory" estimates the net increase for 1917 at 175,000 "population," which represents 148,750 communicants, a falling off in net gains of 241,250. The reason which promptly suggests itself is failure of immigration, which has long been a source of increase to that polyglot Church.

Dr. Carroll is curiously mistaken both in his figures and his conclusion. He had taken the statistics for 1916 and ascribed them, by an explicable but rather unscientific oversight, to 1917. The fact is that the figures for 1917 are now set forth for the first time in the 1918 issue of the "Official Catholic Directory," published by P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York, and at present in the hands of the binder. We find that the increase in the number of Catholics for the year 1917 actually amounts to 393,424. Nor does this represent the entire growth of the Catholic Church in the United States, since in thirty-eight dioceses no new census was taken last year. The conclusion consequently is exactly the opposite of that drawn by Dr. Carroll; for since no immigration was possible, as he himself argues, it follows that the splendid growth of the Church during the past year has been entirely indigenous, not foreign but purely American. The present number of Catholics in the United States is 17,416,303. Our total increase during the last ten years has been no less than 3,538,877. Mr. Joseph H. Meier, who during all this period has compiled these statistics for the "Catholic Directory," adds the following important comment:

The figure 17,416,303 is not at all exaggerated, in fact, the figure is low, as no records can be kept of the "floating" Catholic population and as nearly all of the thirty-eight dioceses in which no census was taken have surely increased in population during the past few years. If it were possible to show the increases for the thirty-eight dioceses, among which are some of the important Archdioceses in the country, and if it were possible to gather data on the

"floating" Catholic population of the United States, the actual Catholic population of this country would be shown to be over 19,000,000. Special care was taken so that the young men in the military service would not be counted twice, that is, once in the diocese in which the camp or cantonment was located and again in their home dioceses. Arrangements were made to include only the Catholic soldiers and sailors in their home dioceses.

If to the figures already quoted we add the number of Catholics in Alaska, the Canal Zone, the Virgin Islands, Guam, our possessions in Samoa, the Hawaiian Islands, Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands, it will be found, according to the advance sheets of the "Catholic Directory", that the total number of Catholics under the protection of the Stars and Stripes is 26,266,642. Taking into account all the inevitable omissions in such a census it is safe to say that there are approximately 30,000,000 Catholics under the folds of our starry banner. In the list of Catholic army and navy chaplains will be found the names of 309 Catholic priests. Additional chaplains have since been appointed, but their names arrived too late for insertion in the new issue of the Directory. We may further judge the development of the Church by these items of special interest:

There are now 20,477 Catholic priests in the United States. Of this number 14,922 are secular priests and 5,555 are priests of Religious Orders. Other figures are as follows: archbishops, 13; bishops, 93; churches with resident priests, 10,369; missions with churches, 5,448; seminaries, 106; seminarians, 7,238; parochial schools, 5,748; children attending parochial schools, 1,593,407; colleges for boys, 217; academies for girls, 677; orphan asylums, 297; homes for aged, 109.

We are further informed that there are now twenty-seven States in the Union with a Catholic population of 100,000 souls or more.

Passing of a Great Missionary

THE REV. GEORGE DE LA MOTTE, S.J., whose death occurred recently at St. Ignatius Mission, Montana, was a man who combined in himself many exceptional qualities. As a brilliant theologian he distinguished himself at Woodstock College, Md., by the public defense of all philosophy and theology. Later he was made rector of the Jesuit School of philosophy and theology in the far West, and taught in the department of theology. At another period he was superior of the entire Rocky Mountain "Mission" of the Jesuits, which he directed for many years. When in 1907 the Jesuit Missions of California and of the Rocky Mountains were combined he was again chosen superior to prepare them for the further development that was soon to follow, when they were erected into the independent California Province of the Society of Jesus. While these achievements made him a man of public note, he will perhaps be best remembered as an ardent missionary to the Indians. Among them he had spent his early years of activity in the religious life, learning their tongue and teaching them the mysteries of the Faith. With them his heart remained always, no matter what honors might be given him or what dignities thrust upon him. When relieved of the duties of his public office he at once asked to be sent back to his beloved Indians. He was one of the most revered and successful missionaries that have labored among these tribes, and Mission Valley will long bear its testimony to his life of heroic sacrifice and devotion to duty. He was master of three different Indian languages, and loved nothing better than to teach his redskin children the rudiments of our holy religion, to picture to them the scenes of the sacred life and death of Christ, or to instruct them in his clear and simple way in the sublime mysteries of Christianity. The Catholic Indian Missions have sustained a great loss through the death of this zealous priest, and our Indian Mission Bureau has been deprived of one of its most efficient and ardent colaborers.